Imprimatur,

Jan. 7, 1686. *JO. BATTELY.*

ERRATA.

PAge 104. line 11. for *the Jews* r. their Perſons. P. 119. line 9. for *Cockles* r. *Cocleus.*

Imprimatur,

Jan. 7, 1686. *JO. BATTELY.*

ERRATA.

PAge 104. line 11. for *the Jews* r. their Perſons. P. 119. line 9. for *Cockles* r. *Cocleus.*

Clagett, Wm

d 4c

A VIEW
OF THE
Whole Controverſy
BETWEEN THE
REPRESENTER
AND THE
ANSWERER,
WITH AN
Anſwer to the Repreſenter's *laſt Reply:*

In which are laid open ſome of the Methods by which *Proteſtants* are Miſrepreſented by *Papiſts.*

LONDON:
Printed for *William Rogers*, at the *Sun*, againſt St. *Dunſtan's* Church in *Fleetſtreet*, MDCLXXXVII.

A VIEW

Of the Whole

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

Repreſenter *and the* Anſwerer.

THE *Repreſenter* was loth to part with his *Anſwerer* without *asking him in civility how he did:* Now from ſo civil a perſon, I may, for ought I know, have the courteſy of a turn or two, for asking; which if he will allow me, I ſhall at laſt deſire *a word or two with him before we part, and that chiefly, in civility to ask him* How *He* does? I would intreat him to go back with me as far as to *a Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented*, that we may ſee how matters have been carried all along, ſince that Book gave occaſion to this Controverſy. How I ſhall ſpeed in this Requeſt, is hard to ſay, for 'tis a favour that his Second Adverſary did not obtain, who fairly led the way, when the Walk was not quite ſo long as it is grown ſince. But with, or without his Company, this is the way I muſt needs go; and becauſe I will not do it, without giving the *Repreſenter* a Reaſon, 'tis this: I hope to ſatisfy

Reply, p. 1.

Anſw. to Pap. Prot. &c. p. 125.

thoſe who will go along with me, That he has but jeſted all this while; and (to make his words ſpeak truth for once) has *paſſed over all his* Adverſaries Anſwers
Reply, p. 2. *with a light touch* (moſt of them with none at all) *and the moſt Artificial way of* replying, *with ſaying nothing to 'em, as can poſſibly be met with.*

It was well done of him to tell the Reader in the Title Page of his laſt *Reply*, That it was a *Fourth Vindication of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented*, &c. for if he had not ſaid ſo, really men could not have believed it. There were *Thirty ſeven* double Characters of a *Papiſt* laid down with ſolemn order in the firſt Book, to tell the World what he is by us falſly ſaid to be, and what he is truly in himſelf: And this later *Character* was fortified with ſuch Arguments to juſtify his Faith and Practiſe, as could be had. What now is become of all this? What ſaies the *Fourth Vindication* in defence of any one particular Complaint, Repreſentation, or Argument? Why not a word that I can find, unleſs it
P. 11. be where he barely asks, What we think of *Praying to Images*, and of ſome few other things, and of more than he would ſpeak of, *which ſtand charged upon the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented.* He puts theſe Queſtions ſhortly and confidently, as if nothing had been yet ſaid to any of them. And his behaviour would almoſt perſwade a man, that his double Characters were yet to be conſidered, and his Reaſons yet to be Anſwered. So one would think indeed by comparing his firſt and laſt Books together, without obſerving what has come between them; or, at leaſt, that the Cauſe is dropt by one Side, or the other: And let him that thinks ſo, think ſo ſtill; for that is the plain Truth of the Caſe, which I ſhall make out by an Argument that will do the buſineſs to the ſatisfaction

of

of all men but the *Repreſenter*; and that is, That *He* hath dropt it.

This I ſhall do in the *Firſt* place, if it be but to try whether he will take notice of it in the beginning of this Anſwer, tho he would not beſtow a word upon it, when he found it at the end of another. Anſw. to Pap. Prot. p. 125.

And perhaps, now that the length of this Controverſy, together with the windings and turnings of the *Repreſenter*, has made it ſomething uneaſy to be comprehended; it may not be ungrateful to thoſe that have concerned themſelves in it, to have ſome general proſpect of it, all at once before them; which I ſhall make as ſhort and as eaſy as I can, in going through the ſeveral Books that have been written in this Cauſe, ſince the firſt.

The Firſt Anſwer to the Repreſenter.

THE firſt Book that called him to account, was *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of* Rome *truly Repreſented*; in which, the Learned Author, having firſt made ſome Exceptions againſt the *Repreſenter's* way of proceeding in his double Characters, went on to examine his Characters Point by Point. Every Queſtion was particularly and exactly ſtated, and the ſenſe of the Church of *Rome* about it was ſhewn, by the Decrees of the *Trent*-Council, or their *Roman* Catechiſm, or their Publick Offices, and their moſt approved Divines and Caſuiſts, as the matter required. This was done very diſtinctly throughout the whole *Anſwer*, where he ſaw cauſe to correct the ſtate of the Queſtion; that the Reader might ſee the grounds of every particular charge, that we and our Anſwer to Introduction.

Fathers have laid againſt the Church of *Rome.* And thus, by the way, all the falſe colours of the *Repreſenter* were taken off, where he thought it for his purpoſe to lay them on too Foul on his *Miſrepreſenting*, or too Fair on his *Repreſenting* ſide.

But this was not all; for whereas the *Repreſenter*, not altogether truſting to his Arts of Repreſentation, thought fit ſometimes to urge, never fail'd to inſinuate, Arguments in favour of his ſide of the Queſtion; The *Anſwerer*, without omitting any ſhadow of Reaſon offered by the *Repreſenter*, took all his Argumentations, and every pretence from Scripture, into particular examination: I ſay, he took them one by one in their place and order, and made it appear, that they were very faulty; as we at leaſt thought, and as we may think ſtill, for any thing that we have heard to the contrary.

Nay, to give occaſion to a more perfect underſtanding of theſe matters, He took *Popery as Repreſented by the Repreſenter* himſelf in one Colume, and gave him *Our Reaſons againſt it*, in another.

And becauſe, to gain the greater opinion of ſincerity, the *Repreſenter* had with *Anathema's* diſclaimed ſeveral points, which, as he ſaid, are imputed to *Papiſts* by *Proteſtants*; the *Anſwerer* conſidered him here too, very particularly, and ſeemed to diſcover inſincerity in the *Repreſenter*, even where one would be moſt apt to believe him to be in good earneſt.

To all which I muſt add, That this was done throughout with that Calmneſs and Moderation, that his Adverſary did not think fit to diſſemble it. So that this Book wanted nothing to make it deſerve a fair and full Reply, or at leaſt ſome honourable ſort of Conceſſion, That the Subject would not bear it.

For

For ſurely no Method of Anſwering the *Repreſenter* could be more Compleat, Honeſt, and Manly, than this was; nor ſerve better to put all thoſe, for whoſe ſake Books are written, into a way of judging what Popery indeed is, and whether we have rightly condemned it or no, if they were not already ſatisfied in theſe things; eſpecially becauſe all was done with that plainneſs and perſpicuity, that if the Diſcourſe was in any particular greatly defective, it could not but be obvious to an Adverſary, that was, it ſeems, thought a fit Perſon by his Superiors, to Repreſent Popery to this Kingdom, and to defend it againſt this Church.

The Firſt Reply of the Repreſenter.

TO this Anſwer the *Repreſenter* publiſhed a *Reply* under the Title of *Reflections* upon it. Now did he in theſe *Reflections* undertake to ſhew from Point to Point, That the *Anſwerer* had without cauſe corrected either the *Miſrepreſenting* or the *Repreſenting* Side, where he undertook to correct them? Did he, as the *Anſwerer* has done before him, take the Queſtions in their Order, to examine how they were ſtated, and where need was, did he pretend to ſtate them better? Nay, Did he bear up fairly to any one point of Repreſentation that his Adverſary thought fit to alter, and try by the force of his Learning to reduce it to what it was when he left it? No truly, his mind did not ſerve him, for ſtating of Queſtions.

But did he not ſtand up in defence of his *Anathema's* which his *Anſwerer* charged, not without giving Reaſons for it, with *Art* and *Sophiſtry*? No, he did not ſo much as offer at it.

What

What then was the buſineſs of his *Reflections*? Did they turn upon *our Reaſons againſt Popery as Repreſented* by the *Repreſenter*? No ſure; Nor was it likely that he ſhould be forward to anſwer our Arguments, that had no Fancy to defend his own.

What? Did he not betake himſelf to make good his own particular Arguments in behalf of Popery, againſt his Adverſaries Anſwers? Nothing leſs, I aſſure you; he did not take care ſo much as of one Argument belonging to any one point, but fairly left them all to take their Fortune: Is it not enough for a man to bring Arguments, but he muſt be troubled to defend them? Well; From this time forward, the *Repreſenters* buſineſs was not to *Diſpute*, but to *Repreſent*. But was it ſo from the beginning? The *Repreſenter* indeed has ever ſince ſo vehemently diſclaimed *Diſputing*, that perhaps he only *Repreſented* at firſt. Let us therefore try that a little.

Were there not three Arguments for *Veneration of Images*, and for *Praying to Saints*? Were not *Moſes*, *Job*, *Stephen*, the *Romans*, the *Corinthians*, the *Epheſians*, and *almoſt every ſick Perſon that deſires the Prayers of the Congregation*, engaged one way or other? Did he not argue for *Tranſubſtantiation* from our Saviours *Words*, from the *Power* of God, from the incompetency of *Senſe* and *Reaſon* to judg in this, no leſs than in ſome other caſes? I think this is *Diſputing*. There were three Texts of Scripture to juſtifie the *Reſtraining* of *Chriſtian* people *from reading the Scripture*. And if they are not vaniſhed out of the Book, there are about ſeven Reaſons for *Communion in one Kind*: The 12*th* Chapter of the 2*d* Book of *Maccab.* was once thought one good Authority for the Doctrine of *Purgatory*; and St. *Matth.* 12. 32, another; And a little pretence

pretence of Antiquity there was beſide, and three or four more Reaſons for it; and in this ſtrain the Book went all along: Now this I ſay, Thoſe Arguments were not made by the *Anſwerer*, but they were anſwered by him, and ſo were all the reſt, and now they may go ſhift for themſelves.

And yet this is the Gentleman, who with no ſmall opinion of himſelf, takes his Adverſary to task for *letting his Arguments drop*, nay, *for not ſaying one word to all his own Reaſons preſſed againſt himſelf*; but *letting the matter fall very cautiouſly, when it comes to his own turn of Diſputing and Defending his own Reaſonings*, and that too *in a Caſe directly appertaining to our main point of Repreſenting*, &c. Now this is a biting Accuſation, if it be a *True* one; and before we part, I hope we ſhall have a word or two about *that*. But if it were as true, as I am well aſſured 'tis falſe, the *Repreſenter*, of all men living, ſhould have made no words on't; and that not only becauſe himſelf is a moſt notorious example of forſaking his own Arguments in their diſtreſs, but becauſe his Adverſary was ſo generous to wink at *him* when *he* ſtole off from his Diſputing poſt, upon the very firſt attack that was made upon *him*. For I do not remember that he charges him with this, in ſhewing the progreſs of the Controverſie; and indeed, conſidering all his other Advantages, there was no need of it. So that if the *Repreſenter* had been content, this might have been forgotten ſtill; but if a man ows himſelf a ſhame, he does well to pay it. *Reply*, p. 2, 3, 4, &c.

Well, but what went the *Reflections* upon, all this while? By this time I think a ſtranger may gueſs the Truth, and that is, that the *Reflections* were to flutter up and down between the Anſwer to the *Introduction*, and the Anſwer to the *Book*; and to ſettle

no

no where. And now I ſhall give as ſhort and faithful an abſtract of them, as I can. In the Anſwer to the Introduction, the *Anſwerer* declared himſelf unſatisfied with the *Repreſenters method to clear his Party from Miſrepreſentations*; and particularly, that he ſhould make his own *ignorant*, *childiſh*, or *wilful miſtakes*, the Proteſtant Repreſentations of Popery, as that *the Papiſts are never permitted to hear Sermons which they are able to underſtand*, and the like. Now from hence the Repreſenter deſires leave to aſſure his Friends, that the Proteſtant Repreſentations of Popery are *ignorant*, *childiſh*, or *wilful miſtakes*. One would not have expected ſo mean a Cavil, ſo ſoon after he had promiſed *moſt material Points*; But becauſe I find in his *Proteſting Reply*, that he is aſhamed to own it, I ſhall take no further notice of this, than to tell him, He ought to have been more aſhamed to deny it; it being ſo manifeſt, that what the Anſwerer ſaid of *ſome* of his Miſrepreſentations, he applied to *all* that himſelf calls *Miſrepreſentations*, that his utmoſt Art will never be able to diſguiſe it to any man that will take ſo much fruitleſs pains, as to compare the places. But to proceed,

Reply, p. 4.

p. 1.

An. p. 10.
Rep. p. 3, 4.

1. Whereas the Anſwerer juſtly expoſed him for pretending to *draw his Miſrepreſentations exactly according to his own Apprehenſions*, when himſelf was a Proteſtant; he now affirms, that he can juſtifie his Proteſtant Characters of Papiſts, by Proteſtant Books, which he names, and out of one of them [*Sutcliffs Survey*) he produces ſome ſharp ſayings concerning Popery. Nay, he thinks to defend his Complaints of Miſrepreſentation, by thoſe very words of the *Anſwerer* concerning *that Popery which the Repreſenter allows.*

Pag. 2, 3.

We

we can never yield to it without betraying the Truth, renouncing our Senſes and our Reaſon, wounding our Conſciences, &c.

2. Whereas the *Anſwerer* excepted againſt his *Repreſenting Part*, wherein he pretends to keep to a Rule, That the *Repreſenter* ſhewed no Authority that he, a private Man, had to interpret the Rule in his own Senſe, againſt the Judgment of Great Divines, as in the Queſtion of the *Popes Perſonal Infallibility*; and againſt the Determinations of Popes and Councils, as in the Queſtion concerning the *Depoſing Power*. The *Repreſenter* replies, That he followed the Council of *Trent*, which he does not interpret, but takes in the Senſe of the *Catechiſm*: That he alſo kept to *Veron's* Rule of Faith, and to the Biſhop of *Condom's* Expoſition, ſo highly approved by Pope and Cardinals, &c. As to the Inſtances, having firſt ran to the Book for two more, he comes back with them to the two that were mentioned, and replies, 1. That whereas he *limited* the power of the Saints to help us *to their prayers*, he followed the Council, and the Catechiſm, and the Biſhop of *Condom*. 2. That he did not qualifie the Doctrine of *Merit*, without Authority, ſince it is ſo qualified by *Trid. Seſſ. 6. Can. 26.* 3. That the *Popes Perſonal Infallibility* is not determined by a General Council. 4 That the *Depoſing Power* was never eſtabliſhed under an *Anathema*, as a Doctrinal Point; and thoſe two are therefore no Articles of Faith.

P. 5, 6.

P. 7, 8.

P. 9, 10.

3. He makes theſe *Reflections* upon the *Anſwerers* proceeding in the *Book*, That he either 1. owns part of the *Repreſenters* Doctrine to be the eſtabliſhed Belief of the Church of *England*: Or, 2. Does without

P. 11.

good Reaſon deny part of it to be the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, *appealing from the Definitions of their Councils, and ſenſe of their Church*, either to *ſome Expreſſions found in old Maſs-Books and Rituals*, &c. *Or to ſome external Actions, in caſe of Reſpect ſhewn to Images and Saints*, as *Bowing, Kneeling*, &c. Or
P. 12.
P. 13, 14. finally, to *private Authors*. Upon which follows a grievous Complaint of Miſrepreſenting upon the laſt account.

4. From hence he goes back to the *Anſwer to the Introduction*, where he was charged for ſaying, That
P. 15, 16. the Popes *Orders are to be obeyed, whether he be infallible or not*: From whence it follows, That Papiſts *are bound to Act, when the Pope ſhall require it, according to the Depoſing Power*. He replies, That he gives no more to the Pope, than to Civil Soveraigns, whoſe Authority is not ſo *abſolute and unconfined*, but to *ſome of their Decrees, there may be juſt exception*.

P. 16. 5. From hence he flings again into the middle of the Book, and blames the *Anſwerer* for *ſcouting amongſt the School-men*, till the *Queſtion about Diſpenſations to Lye or Forſwear, was loſt*; and that he offered no proof, That the *Diſpenſing Power was to be kept up as a Myſtery, and not uſed, but upon weighty Cauſes*. Then
P. 17. he leaps into the Chapter of *Purgatory*, and affirms, That St. *Perpetua's Viſion* is not the Foundation of
P. 18. Purgatory, but only uſed by him as a *Marginal Citation amongſt many others*. Then a Complaint of Miſrepreſentation again; and becauſe Complaints are not likely to convince us, *Let us*, ſays he, *depend upon an Ex-*
P. 19. *perience; Do but give your Aſſent to thoſe Articles of Faith in the very Form and Manner, as I have ſtated them in the Character of a Papiſt Repreſented, and if you*

are

are not admitted into our Communion, I'le confeſs that I have abuſed the World.

Thus far the *Reflections*: It is now time to compare Things, and to ſee how much of the Cauſe is left ſtanding.

I paſs it by, that the Anſwer to the *Introduction*, upon which the *Repreſenter* ſpent his main Strength, is in many *moſt material Points* untouch'd by the *Reflections*: But this is a ſmall Matter: For, *See for this Anſw. to Pap. Proteſt. p.128.*

1. *He has dropt the defence of his Double Characters, his Repreſentations and Miſrepreſentations.* For inſtead of going on with his Adverſary in thoſe *Thirty Seven* Points, with which himſelf led the way, he does nothing but nibble about Three or Four of them, and that without taking notice of the tenth part of what was ſaid by his Adverſary to fix the true ſtate of the Controverſie even about them: He has indeed thrown about four Looſe, General Exceptions amongſt the Thirty Seven Chapters in which the *Anſwerer* Repreſented the ſeveral Doctrines and Practiſes of the Church of *Rome*; but he has not with any one of theſe Exceptions come up fairly to what the *Anſwerer* has ſaid upon any one particular Point; And therefore I add,

2. *That for any thing our Repreſenter has done to ſhew the contrary, the Anſwerer has truly Repreſented the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of* Rome. And then we have great Encouragement to turn Papiſts, ſince the *Repreſenter* tells us, That if the *Anſwerer has truly Repreſented the Doctrines of the Church of Rome*; He, the *Repreſenter, would as ſoon be a Turk as a Papiſt.*

3. *He has abſolutely dropt the defence of all his own Arguments*, not ſo much as pretending to ſhew where the Anſwers went upon a wrong State of the Queſtion; no, nor trying to reinforce his Arguments, where the State of the Controverſie was agreed upon on both ſides: So that for ought I can ſee, the *Repreſenter* fell ſick of his *Thirty Seven* Chapters all at once, both as to matter of *Repreſentation* and *Diſpute*: And this I think was pretty well for the *Firſt Reply*.

The Second Anſwer to the Repreſenter, being a Reply to His Reflections.

BUT we are to thank the *Reflections* for one good Thing, and that is for the Anſwer which they drew from another Learned Hand, under the Title of a *Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants*: In which I ſhall make bold to leave out ſeveral Material Points, which the *Anſwerer* offered to Conſideration, and take notice of no more, than what I think may ſerve to ſhew with what Sincerity on the One Side, and Inſincerity on the Other, this Controverſie has been managed. Wherefore,

1. Whereas the *Repreſenter* choſe to juſtify his complaints of Miſrepreſentation, not by taking the firſt Anſwerers Repreſentations into examination, but by referring us to other Books, and to *Sutcliff*'s ſharp cenſures of Popery; The ſecond *Anſwerer* conſider'd that the *Repreſenter* called the *Cenſures* which Proteſtants

teſtants puts upon the Avowed Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, *Miſrepreſentations*: which was in the firſt Book diſcernible enough, and ſpoken of in the Anſwer to it; but was ſo groſly owned in his ſecond Book, that no man could now doubt of it: For he made his *Anſwerer* guilty of Miſrepreſentation for ſaying, That *we cannot yield to that Popery which the* Repreſenter *himſelf allows, without betraying the Truth*, &c. This Anſwer therefore blames him for putting into the *Proteſtant* Repreſentations of *Popery*, thoſe faults which we find, and thoſe ill conſequences which we charge upon *Popery*, as if we would make the World believe, that *Papiſts* think as ill of what themſelves *profeſs* and *practice*, as we do: And much more for putting theſe conſequences, as owned by *Papiſts*, in the Front of the *Proteſtant* Characters of them, as if we pretended, they were the *Firſt Principles* of *Popery*. As for the Doctrines and Practiſes of the *Roman* Church, which we charge them with, the *Repreſenter generally owned them*; but he diſowned, *as he eaſily might*, the belief of thoſe Conſequences and Interpretations which we charge upon them. And therefore his putting them into the *Proteſtant* Characters of a *Papiſt*, was *his own* Artifice of laying the fouler colours upon *Popery* on the one ſide, that it might look the fairer, when he took them off, on the other. Now to prevent theſe Deceits for the future, this Anſwer goes through the Thirty ſeven Articles again, to ſhew under each Head, what we charge *upon them* as their Doctrines and Practiſes; which is properly matter of *Repreſentation*: And likewiſe, what we charge *upon ſuch Doctrines and Pra-*

A Papiſt not Miſrepr. p. 4.

P. 5.

P. 6. to p. 40.

Practiſes, which is properly matter of *Diſpute*: By the confounding of which two things, the *Repreſenter* had made a colour for his unjuſt complaints of *Miſrepreſentation.*

2. Whereas he pretended that he never delivered his own private ſenſe and opinion in Repreſenting
P. 44, 45. a *Papiſt*; the *Anſwerer* replies, that he certainly does ſo, when he determines concerning Queſtions which are diſputed among themſelves, whether they be Articles of Faith, or not; and that the *Catechiſm* may be interpreted by a private ſpirit as well as the *Council.* That *Veron*'s Rule, had no more Authority than the *Repreſenter*'s *Characters.* That *Bellarmines* Controverſies had atteſtation from the Pope, as well as the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Expoſition; And that *Canus* himſelf, who is referred to by the *Repreſenter*, acknowledges that the Popes approbation is not always to *be accounted the judgment of the Apoſtolick See.* As to the Inſtances, The *Anſwerer*
P. 45, 46. ſhews, 1. *Of his limitting the Power of the Saints to their Prayers*; That no ſuch limitation of their Aid and Aſſiſtance, is to be found in the Council; That the *Repreſenter* would take no notice of what his firſt *Anſwerer* had ſaid, to ſhew that no ſuch limitation was intended in the *Council* or the *Catechiſm*; And that he did not find this limitation in the Bi-
P. 12, 13. ſhop of *Condom.* 2. Of *Merit*; That the Twenty ſixth Canon of the ſixth Seſſion, mentions nothing of it; and that it is clear from Chap. 16. of that Seſſion, That they make Good works truly and properly meritorious of Eternal Life, tho they grant the Grace of God, and the Merits of Chriſt, to be the cauſe of their own Merits. Finally, That the

An-

Anſwerer did not Appeal to the Thirty ſecond Canon to oppoſe the *Repreſenter's* Qualification of the Doctrine of Merit, and was therefore unconcern'd in his defence of it. 3. As to the *Pope's Perſonal Infallibility*; That he denies it to be of Faith, and makes it but a School point; whileſt there are as many who deny it to be a School point, and make it a matter of their Faith. That the want of *poſitive Determination* by a General Council, does not prove it to be no matter of Faith, becauſe neither the Infallibility of a General Council, nor of the Church, is poſitively determined by a General Council. That if Infallibility muſt be ſomewhere amongſt them, they have the beſt Reaſon that place it in the Pope. 4. As to the *depoſing Doctrine*, the *Anſwerer* ſhewed largely and clearly, That Articles of Faith may be, and have been decreed without *Anathema's*; That the depoſing Decree includes a Doctrinal point; That if it were meerly a point of Diſcipline and Government, they muſt either acknowledg it Lawful for the Church to depoſe Heretical Princes, or conſent that the Church is not ſecured from making wicked Decrees, in things that concern the whole Chriſtian World. That when the *Repreſenter* ſays, That ſome Decrees of *Trent* are not *univerſally received*, he does not tell us that the Council had no Authority to make them, and to oblige Princes to receive them. And laſtly, That the Pope's letting ſo many aſſerters of the *No-depoſing Power* to paſs without any cenſure of Hereſy, does not argue a change of their Doctrine, but only of the *Times*.

P. 46. P. 47, 48. P. 49. P. 54. P. 56. P. 57.

3. To the *Repreſenter's* Reflections upon the *Anſwerer's* way of proceeding, as that 1. *He owns in ſome*

ſome part the Repreſenter's Doctrine to be the eſtabliſhed Doctrine of the Church of England; The ſecond *Anſwerer* charges him with foul Miſrepreſentation upon this account, in as much as the firſt *Anſwerer owned nothing which is peculiar to the Faith of a Papiſt, as diſtinguiſhed from the common Faith of Chriſtians*; and that the *Repreſenter* might as well
P. 59, 60, 61. have ſaid, That *becauſe Proteſtants own that Chriſt is to be worſhipped, therefore they* in part *own the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *That Chriſt is to be worſhipped by Images.* And this he ſhewed to be the very caſe in every one of thoſe ſix or ſeven Points, which the *Repreſenter* only named, but did not think fit to inſiſt upon, to ſhew how his Reflection was applicable to them. 2. And that the firſt *Anſwerer appealed from the definitions of their Church*, &c. 1. *To ſome Expoſitions found in old Maſs-Books and*
P. 62. *Rituals.* This *Anſwerer* ſays, that he could find but one Inſtance of this, relating to the Worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*; *viz.* that ſcandalous Hymn, *O Felix Puerpera*, &c. But that their Church is accountable for her old Miſſals, which were the allowed and eſtabliſhed Offices of Worſhip; That even this has never been condemned; but that Monſieur *Widenfelts* Book was condemned at *Rome*, which was *writ*
P. 63. *to bring the people to a bare* Ora pro Nobis, *to the Bleſſed Virgin.* 2. *To ſome external Action as in caſe of reſpect ſhewn to Images and Saints.* To this the *Anſwerer* ſays, That the *Repreſenter* brings in this Exception, without taking the leaſt notice of what his firſt Adverſary ſaid concerning external
P. 63, 64. Adoration, That *it is a part of Divine Worſhip*; and that the Council of *Trent* requires it ſhould be given

given to Images. He ſhews further, That ſince there is ſuch a thing as external and viſible Idolatry; an Idolatrous action is nevertheleſs ſuch, P. 65. for the intention of him that is guilty of it, not to commit Idolatry; That the worſhip of the Inviſible Inhabitants of the other World, tho with ſuch external acts as may be paid to creatures, has always been accounted Religious Worſhip; That as the *Degrees* of Civil honour are diſtinguiſh'd by the *ſight of the Object*; So one certain diſtinction between Civil and Religious is, that the worſhip of an Inviſible Object is always *Religious*; and that to Worſhip the Image of an Inviſible Being, muſt therefore be Religious Worſhip alſo; becauſe 'tis referred to the *Prototype*. 3. *To the ſentiments of private Authors.* And here the preſent *Anſwerer challenges him to give one inſtance wherein the Judgment of private Authors was*, as he pretended, *ſet up againſt the declared ſenſe of their Councils and Church:* And moreover ſhews what uſe was made of private Authors, by particular Inſtances; P. 68, 69. and that ſometimes recourſe is neceſſary to be had to them, and to the general practice of their Church, to know the ſenſe of their Church.

P. 66.

P. 67.

4. Whereas the *Repreſenter* avoided the charge of their being obliged by his Doctrine to obey the Pope, when he commands them to act in purſuance of the Depoſing Power; by pretending that the Decrees of Popes may be excepted againſt no leſs than the commands of Civil Soveraigns, as the caſe may be. The *Anſwerer* does *acknowledg* P. 58. *this* Reply *to be good*, if the *Repreſenter* be ſincere in the Application, and will *grant the Depoſing De-*

cree to command a Sin; and that *Bellarmin* and *Canus* were mistaken in asserting, That *Popes and General Councils can make no sinful Decrees relating to the whole Church.*

5. To the complaint of discoursing upon *Dispensations* out of the *Schoolmen*, and bearing the Reader into a belief, that the *Dispensing Power was kept as a Mystery, to be used upon weighty occasions*, &c. the present Answer saies, That there was reason for the former, this being one of the Instances wherein the whole sense of their Church is not to be had, but from the Practices of Popes, and the Opinions of their Great men. To the latter, That their own *Doctors* had declared it, as the *Answerer* had shewn, before he said it himself. Then as to St. *Perpetua's* Vision, That if *he did not think it gave some credit to the Doctrine of Purgatory*, it was *mentioned* by him to no purpose. Finally, to the *Representer's* Invitation of us to come over to their Church upon his Terms, with promise of Acceptance; the *Answerer* returns, That he must *like their Faith better first*. And certainly the Invitation was something unseasonable, before the *Representer* had answer'd *our Reasons against that Popery, which* himself *allows*. And this for the second Answer.

P. 69.

P. 70.

The

The Second Reply of the Repreſenter, *being an Anſwer, to* a Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants.

THE ſecond *Reply* comes forth under the Title of *Papiſts Proteſting againſt Proteſtant Popery.* Pap. Prot. p. 4. In which the *Repreſenter* beginning with a defence of himſelf as to his conſtruction of the *wilful miſtakes*, (ſee before, *p.* 8.) which if he pleaſes ſhall be forgotten from this time forward: falls a wondring that there ſhould be *ſuch a noiſe about expoſing of their Doctrines to open view*; declares, that tho *he diſcovered what he thought, and ſometimes ſaid briefly, why*; yet he *made not diſputing his buſineſs*; and knows not how this ſhould be taken as a piece of controverſy againſt the Church of *England*, which he had not charged with *Miſrepreſentation*, nor any body elſe, but thoſe only in general that are guilty. He complains that his ſecond *Anſwerer* makes that which they call *Miſrepreſentation*, to be *in all the material points*, a *Repreſentation* of the *avowed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of* Rome; and proteſts, That if *Popery be guilty of what he ſaies, it cannot enter into his thoughts there's any room for it in Heaven.* For the *very Title* of his Book *is a condemnation of the Religion to all thoſe horrid ſhapes it has been at any time expoſed in by the Members of the Reformation:* And ſo is his pretence, that *We* P. 5. P. 6. P. 7.

charge Papists with nothing but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practice. But since they must not learn what *Papists* believe from the *Council* and the *Catechism*, but from the *Writings* and *Sermons* of *Protestants*; he is resolved to give us a taste of their way of Representing Popery; and therefore,

1. He recites several passages wherein Popery is Misrepresented, as he will have it, out of a Book of *John*, sometime Lord Archbishop of *York*, and
P. 9. to p. 17. a Book of Dr. *Beard*, and *Sutcliffs Survey*, and the Book of *Homilies*. And in conclusion he tells us, That this is the *Protestant Popery*, which since he protests against no less than the *Answerer*, *Protestants* and *Papists* may now go *shake hands*; and *What possibility is there of farther divisions?* But if this be intended for a true Representation of Popery, *Roman Catholicks suffer under the greatest injustice imaginable.* And then follows a vehement expostulation against the iniquity of such
P. 18. *Misrepresentation.* And whereas the *Answerer* blamed him for putting into the Protestant Character of a Papist, those ill consequences we charge upon their Doctrines and Practices, as if we pretended that they think of their own profession
P. 20. and practice just as we do: He Replies, That this is a *pretty speculative quarrel*, and *a quaint conceit*, but *lost, for coming in a wrong place.* For the *Representer*'s business was to *draw the Character* of a Papist, *as it lies in the Peopels Heads*, who when they hear one declaiming against Popery, do not *distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents*, between the *Doctrine of the Papists*, and the fault we

we find with it, but *ſwallow down all in the lump*; and *whoever ſuppoſes otherwiſe, muſt conclude them to be better at* ſeparating, *than the* Chymiſts, and *that in ſubtle* Diſtinctions *they are able to out-do* Ariſtotle *himſelf*. This is in ſhort, what he ſays with much circumſtance, and no little contentment, for four Pages together; and 'tis all that he thinks fit to return to his *Anſwerers* careful diſtinction between matters of *Repreſentation* and of *Diſpute*, through all the Particulars: For though he confeſſes 'tis *Learnedly* done, yet the almoſt *Forty Pages* about it, might have been ſpared, becauſe *this Diſtinction is not to be found in the Notion the people have of Popery*. P. 22. P. 23.

For the reſt, about his *denying the Belief of our Interpretations*, and the two other Particulars, *p.* 24. They are ſo little to the Purpoſe, that I can afford them no room in this Abſtract; and he that will not take my Word for it, may go to the Anſwer to *Pap. Prot.* p. 20, 21. and there ſatisfie himſelf.

2. To his Adverſaries Queſtion, Whether the *Catechiſm* may not be expounded *by a private Spirit*, as well as the *Council*? He ſays, *Thus a Queſtion or two is a full Confutation of the Reflecter*. To the Teſtimony of *Canus*, That *that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the Apoſtolick See, which is given only by the Biſhop of* Rome, *privately, maliciouſly, and inconſiderately*, &c. He replies, That ſo *Reverend an Authority*, as that of the Biſhop of *Condom*, is not to be thus *overthrown*, ſince his *Expoſition* was *examined with all due Deliberation, approved with all Solemnity*, &c. *and recommended by his Holineſs to be read by all the Faithful*: Upon which occaſion he puts himſelf into ſome Heat, That we who pro- P. 25. P. 26.

teſt

teſt *againſt their Religion* ſhould pretend to *underſtand* it better than a *Catholick Prelate eminent in the Church*, &c. and than thoſe who *depend upon it for their Salvation.* As to the Inſtances; and 1. Of the *Invocation of Saints*, he ſays, Their Aid and Aſſiſtance is limited to their Prayers, by the Biſhop of *Condom*, and cites the place; but to what his Adverſary ſaid concerning the Intention of the Council, and of the Catechiſm in this Matter, he ſays nothing. The Inſtance of *Merit* he paſſes by: But 2*dly*, and 3*dly*, As to the *Popes Perſonal Infallibility*, and the *Depoſing Power*, he pleads the Authority of the Biſhop of *Condom*, that they are no more than matters of *School-Debate*: and, as if he had been in good earneſt at firſt, he does again promiſe we ſhall be admitted into his Church, without the belief of theſe Articles: So that he has every way Repreſented the Faith of a *Papiſt* aright; and now has found out ſomething in his Adverſary to be *anſwered with a ſmile*, That a *Proteſtant ſhould underſtand the Faith of a Papiſt better than the Papiſt himſelf does.* And thus all being guarded by the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Authority, and his own Propoſal, it was his mere Civility to take any notice of his Adverſaries anſwers to his Argument about the *Depoſing Power*, from the want of an *Anathema* to the Decree. And ſo he replies, 1. That every thing is not *an Article of Faith*, which *is declared in a General Council, without an Anathema.* 2. That *to decree what ſhall be done*, does not include a Virtual Definition of Doctrine, as he thinks his Adverſary himſelf ſhewed under the next Particular, from the Council of the Apoſtles at *Hieruſalem.* 3. That the

P. 27.

P. 28, 29.

P. 30.

P. 30, 31.

the Deposing Decree does not *relate to things necessary to Salvation*, nor *concern the whole Church*. And whereas his Adversary imputes the Escape of those that oppose this Decree, to a Change of Times, and the *Popes want of Power*, he tells us, That *Oracles are ceas'd now-a-days*. P. 32.

3. As to *Veneration of Images*, he says, That although *Acts of Honour expressed to any Image that has Relation to some Invisible Being, be supposed a Religious Honour*, yet *all religious Respect and Honour is not so a Divine Honour, as to make a God constructively of the thing to which it is paid*: Otherwise *Bowing to the Altar*, and to the *Name of Jesus*, cannot be excused, since these things *relate to the Invisible Inhabitants of the other World*; nay, *All religious Respect, besides to God*, must then be *constructive Idolatry*: Therefore as the different Kinds and Degrees of Civil Honour are distinguished by the sight of the Objects, tho the External Acts are the same, so the different Kinds and Degrees of Religious Honour are distinguished by the Intention of the Givers, and by Circumstances. He says further, as to the unalterableness of the Nature of Actions determined by a Law, That if this makes the Intention of doing no evil in Bowing or Kneeling to an Image, unable to excuse those from sin, who do this forbidden thing; this *strikes as severely at Bowing to the Altar, and Kneeling to the Sacrament, as at them*, since the Actions forbidden, are the same part of Divine Worship in both Cases. Finally, That a Quaker may justifie his *Yea's* and *Nays*, by his Adversaries Rule, That no Intention can alter the Nature of Actions determined by a Divine Law, since it is said, *Matth.* 5. 34. P. 33. P. 34. P. 35. P. 36. P. 36, 37.

Swear

Swear not at all, but let your Communication, &c. And now to give him his due, ſetting aſide the frivolous Inſtance of the *Quakers*, he has in this Particular come up fairly to his Adverſary, and ſaid what deſerves to be conſidered. Then he concludes with two or three *Requeſts*, which he *hopes* are not *unreaſonable*; to which his Adverſary gave ſuch reaſonable Anſwers, that we have heard of them no more ſince that time, [See *Anſ.* to *Pap. Prot.* p. 124, 125.] and therefore we have no reaſon to be troubled with them here. And ſo let us now come to a Reckoning.

1. *He grants his Adverſaries Diſtinction throughout, between matters of Repreſentation, and matters of Diſpute*; which Diſtinction, ſince himſelf did not obſerve, he either wanted the Skill or the Honeſty of a Repreſenter.

2. The *Defence of his Argument*, That the Popes Perſonal Infallibility is not of Faith, *from no General Council's having determined it*, is dropt.

3. He will not be brought to ſay, Whether the Council of *Trent* had, or had not Authority to oblige Princes to receive thoſe Decrees which are not univerſally received; and ſo the *Defence of his Argument, from ſome Decrees not being received*, is dropt.

4. His ſolemn Cavil, That the Firſt *Anſwerer owned* ſome part of his (the *Repreſenter's*) Doctrine, to be *the Eſtabliſhed Doctrine of the Church of England*; and his Objection againſt him for appealing *to old Maſs-Books and Rituals*, and that other for appealing *to private Authors*, are all three dropt.

5. He

5. He will not say that the *Deposing Decree commands a Sin*; and to *his Defence* of himself against his first *Answerer's* Charge, That by his Principles he is bound upon the Pope's command, *to act according to the Deposing Power*, is dropt.

6. His complaints against his first *Answerer's Representing* the matter of *Dispensations*; and his note upon St. *Perpetua's Vision*, are dropt: But his Invitation of us to come over to the Church of Rome upon his Terms, is not dropt; for we thank him, he has invited us again.

The Third Answer to the Representer, *being* An Answer to a Papist Protesting against Protestant Popery.

TO the *Representer's* wonder, That such ado should be made about his First Book, the *Answerer* sales, That a *Misrepresenter is so foul a Character, that no man can wonder if we think ourselves concerned to wipe it off*; which surely may be done without offence to any, but those that meant us, in the general Accusation. To his complaint that the *Answerer* makes, All that which they call *Misrepresentation*, to be in *all the material points a Representation of the avowed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of* Rome, he sales, That he has done him all the service he can in distinguishing between matters of Fact, wherein P. 1.

if we charge them wrong, we do indeed Miſrepreſent them; and matters of Diſpute, in which, if we ſhould charge them wrong, it is not Miſrepreſentation, but merely a wrong Judgment upon what they profeſs and practice. And he had already
P. 2. ſhewn, That *all matters of Fact* (excepting ſome few points) *in the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented, are confeſſed and defended in the Character of a Papiſt Repreſented.* Now Repreſentation or Miſrepreſentation is properly about matters of Fact. But as for the Conſequences we charge upon their Doctrines and Practices, and which were put into the *Miſrepreſenting* Side, to be taken off again in the *Repreſenting* Side; they are not matters of *Repreſentation*, but of *Diſpute*. To this purpoſe the *Anſwerer* argues, leaving the *Repreſenter* to apply theſe plain things to his *Proteſtation againſt Proteſtant Popery*; which amounts to thus much, That it could *never enter into him, that there ſhould be any room for Popery in Heaven; and that he would as ſoon be a Turk as a Papiſt*, if he thought as ill of the confeſſed Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of* Rome, as we do. Which would be a wiſe Speech no doubt, tho we hope a true one.
P. 3. For the reſt, he ſaies, That *his Title related only to his own Book; and the Book, to the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented*; and therefore 'tis hard that he muſt be *drawn in to anſwer* for more than he knows, even for all that any Proteſtant may have ſaid concerning Popery *ſince the Reformation*; and he thinks it ſtrange, that the *Repreſenter, inſtead of defending his own Characters, ſhould hunt about for new Miſrepreſentations for him to Anſwer.*

For

For ſince he has allowed the Diſtinction between matters of *Repreſentation* and *Diſpute*, and can find no fault with his Adverſaries performance about it; it ſhould ſeem we are agreed upon the Repreſentation of *Popery* now at laſt, and therefore unleſs he *were aſhamed* of his own *Popery*, now we had clearly found it, why ſhould he divert from that, to new complaints of their being Miſrepreſented by others? P. 4.

The *Anſwerer* however was reſolved to ſee what occaſion there was for this freſh complaint.

1. And he ſhews, That *if what was tranſcribed out of the foreſaid Archbiſhop of* York's *Book, be Miſrepreſentation, it is not a Proteſtant, but a Popiſh Miſrepreſentation: For the Archbiſhop cites his Authors for what he ſaies*, tho the Repreſenter *left them out*; And this the *Anſwerer* thought good to ſhew from point to point: And concludes, That *tho every Doctrine found in Popiſh Authors, ought not preſently to be accounted an Article of the Romiſh Faith; yet a Church* ſo watchful to purge, expunge, and cenſure in all Caſes where her Intereſt is concern'd, is Reſponſible for thoſe Doctrines, which have her Toleration and Licenſe, and which *any man among them is allowed to Teach, and to Believe.* As for Dr. *Beard*, and Mr. *Sutcliff*, he ſaies, Thoſe Sayings do not concern *Repreſenting*, but *Diſputing*; and that the *Repreſenter* had unfaithfully concealed, either their Authorities or their Reaſons, which had made the thing plain; or curtail'd their ſayings, as he ſhews by ſeveral Inſtances out of Mr. *Sutcliff*; but that when ſuch Conſequences are charged upon P. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. P. 10, 11, 12, 13.

Popery, it is more to the purpose to Confute them, than to complain of Misrepresentation. Finally, As to the Book of *Homilies*, those things which he hath taken out of it, as the *Answerer* tells him, do no more than shew *the Judgment of our Church about the Worship of Saints and Images in the Church of* Rome; in which he cannot prove us to be Misrepresenters, otherwise than by *confuting* our Arguments; which yet would but shew that we make a wrong Judgment in a matter of Dispute, not that we Misrepresent a matter of Fact. Upon this, the *Answerer* shews, That *Papists* profess and practice the same things that ever they did; and that all this grievous cry of *Misrepresenting*, is grounded upon nothing else, but a Protestation, That they do not believe those ill things of their own Doctrine and Practice, which we do; which altho it be a new business, yet there was no Reason for it, since we never said they did. In the mean time, the Cause is the same that ever it was, which is a sufficient Answer to all that he saies of Protestants and Papists *shaking hands*, &c. And whereas he makes the distinction between Representation and Dispute, to be a speculation above the Vulgar, and so was not to be regarded by him who drew the Character of a Papist as it lay in the peoples heads; The *Answerer* thinks, That he who undertakes to make Characters, is bound to consider what belongs to it; and withal, That our people are not so silly as to think (for instance) that Papists believe the Worship of Images to be Idolatry; or that Idolatry is lawful, because they Worship Images; but that if he

P. 14.

P. 15, 16.

P. 17, 18, 19.

he wrote his Characters for the Information of ſuch Vulgar Heads, as he fancies, he wrote to inform thoſe that can *neither write nor read.* P. 20.

2. As to his Repreſenting, That he did it not by a private Spirit, ſince he followed the Catechiſm; the *Anſwerer* had reaſon to ask, Whether the Catechiſm may not be interpreted by a private Spirit, as well as the Council, ſince their Divines differ in Interpretation of both; and as for the Popes Approbation, he ſaid that *Bellarmine's* Controverſies had it, as well as the Biſhop of *Condom's* Expoſition; to which the *Repreſenter* would ſay nothing; and he now ſays, That by *Canus* his Rule, the ſaid Biſhops Expoſition has not the Authority of the Apoſtolick See, unleſs the Pope had given Judgment for it *ex Cathedra*, which the *Repreſenter* alſo would take no notice of: But what he ſays further concerning the Nature and Deſign of the Approbations given to the Biſhop of *Condom*, I ſhall wholly paſs over, ſince it is by this time ſomewhat plain, that this Biſhops Authority has enough to do to ſhift for it ſelf, and is not in a Condition to ſpare any help to his Friends. As to the limitation of the Aid of the Saints to their Prayers, he acknowledges that it is to be found in the Biſhop of *Condom*, though he miſſed it, becauſe it came not in in the right place. But whereas the *Repreſenter* juſtifies his renouncing the *Popes Perſonal Infallibility*, and the *Depoſing Doctrine*, by the Authority of the ſaid Biſhop; the *Anſwerer* plainly ſhews the Biſhops great Judgment, in having ordered Matters ſo, as to ſave himſelf both with Proteſtants, and with the Pope. To the *Repreſenters* Second Invitation, he anſwers, by making this Propoſal, P. 21. P. 22. P. 118.

P. 15. poſal, Whether their Church would refuſe him admittance, if he ſhould come in upon *Bellarmine*'s terms in theſe Points, which contradict the *Repreſenter*'s; though there *be no reaſon for this Diſpute*, ſince

P. 16. as he ſaid before, he likes not the *Roman* Faith as the *Repreſenter* has deſcribed it? Now to his Replies in behalf of the Depoſing Doctrine being *no Article of Faith*, the *Anſwerer* ſays, 1. That whereas the *Repreſenter* would prove *it was not ſo*, becauſe no *Anathema* was fixed to the Decree; it is ſomething ſtrange, that he ſhould now be content to ſay, Every thing is not an Article of Faith, which is declared without an *Anathema*; for this is next to a downright Conceſſion that his Adverſary had baffled his Argument; and ſhews manifeſtly that he would ſeem to ſay ſomething, when he knew he had nothing to ſay to the purpoſe. 2. He ſhews that the Decree of the Council at *Hieruſalem* did include a Virtual Definition of Doctrine. And 3. That the Depoſing Decree *concerns the whole Church*; and if it be a wicked Decree, that *it relates to a thing neceſſary to Salvation*, by commanding to do that which it is neceſſary to Salvation not to do; and therefore he expects the *Repreſenters further Conſideration* of his three Anſwers.

3. Concerning the *Worſhip of Images*, the *Repreſenter* bids ſo fair for a Diſpute, that the *Anſwerer* took the occaſion, and examined not only what the Biſhop of *Condom* hath delivered upon it, but the ſeveral ways of ſtating it by their Divines; ſhewing that their Images are *Repreſentatives* to receive Worſhip in the Name and Stead of the *Prototype*; that in this Notion Image-Worſhip is condemned in the Scripture,

Scripture, and in what the evil of it conſiſted; a more particular Abridgment of that juſt Diſcourſe upon this Subject I cannot make, without either wronging the *Anſwerer*, or detaining the Reader here too long; and therefore I refer him alſo to the Book it ſelf for an Anſwer to the Charge upon *Bowing towards the Altar*, &c. And to the Apology for Image-Worſhip, from the *Degree* of the Honour that is given to Images: And to the *Repreſenters* Objections againſt that way of diſtinguiſhing Religious from Civil Worſhip, by making that to be Religious, which is given to the Inviſible Inhabitants of the other World; and likewiſe to the pretended Parity of Reaſon in the *Quakers* Caſe. And thus much may ſerve for the Anſwer to Papiſts *Proteſting againſt Proteſtant-Popery.*

P. 83. P. 106, &c. P. 37, 38, 39, 40. P. 123.

The Third Reply of the Repreſenter, *in Return to the Foregoing Anſwer.*

THE *Repreſenter* finds as little Comfort in *Proteſting*, as *Diſputing*, and ſo falls to *Accommodate the Difference between the Repreſenter and the Anſwerer*; and calls his Work *an Amicable Accommodation.* For now he grants the Proteſtants are not guilty of Miſrepreſentation *in a ſtrict and proper Senſe*, and is very ſorry that he and his *Anſwerer* underſtood one another no better before: He thinks indeed it was his *Anſwerer's* Fault, not to conceive him

P. 1, 2.

him right at firſt; and that if his Book had never been Anſwered, the *Peace* had never been broke; but he is perſwaded the Difference may be yet compounded; For the Caſe at firſt was no more than this, That he perceiving the Unchriſtian Hatred which grew in the Vulgar, upon that falſe Notion of Popery, which our *Miſconſtructions*, &c. had drawn in their Imaginations; He, I ſay, Good Man! No leſs in Charity to Proteſtants, than in Juſtice to Papiſts, drew his Double Characters, to ſhew how Popery is Miſrepreſented. But then comes an *Adverſary and ſays, He has proved that the Character of a Papiſt Miſpreſented contains nothing in it, which in a ſtrict and proper Senſe can be called a Miſrepreſentation.* Now really *he never meant to Fight for a Word; and had he but imagined*, that his Adverſary had contended for no more, *he would have ſpared him the Charges and Sweat of laying down his Proofs* the ſecond time.

P. 3. P. 4. P. 5. P. 6.

Wherefore to end the ſtrife, he *ſolemnly declares, that the Title of the* Papiſt Miſrepreſented, *is not to be taken* in its ſtrict and proper Senſe, as *Miſrepreſenting ſignifies* only downright Lying, *or falſly charging matter of Fact, the whole Character being not indeed of this Nature; but in its* larger or leſs proper Senſe, *as it comprehends both* Lying, Calumniating, Miſinterpreting, Reproaching, Miſconſtruing, Miſjudging, *and whatever elſe of this kind.*

But that we may know what a *Lover of Peace* he is, he muſt aſſure the *Anſwerer*, That this *Condeſcenſion* is *purely* out of *good Nature; for betwixt Friends; he does not think* the Anſwerer *has advanced any thing that has the Face of a proof*, That *there can*

P. 7.

be

be no Miſrepreſenting where there is an Agreement about matter of Fact.

Repreſenting, he ſays, *being nothing more than* P. 8.
ſhewing a thing as it is in it ſelf; as many ways as a thing can be ſhewn, otherwiſe than 'tis in it ſelf, ſo many ways may it be properly Miſrepreſented; ſo that the *Deſcription muſt agree with the Thing*, not only in *Matter of Fact*, but likewiſe in Reſpect of *Motive*, *Circumſtance*, *Intention*, *End*, &c. But according to the *Anſwerers* Rule, had the *two Tribes* and *an Half*, P. 9.
been declared Guilty of *ſetting up Altar againſt Altar*; and *Hannah been ſet out amongſt her Neighbours for a Drunken Goſſip*; here had been no Miſrepreſentation, becauſe of ſome *Matter of Fact* in the Caſe. The *Elders* too, that *offered Proof* againſt *Suſanna*, ſince they *ſaw her in the Garden*, &c. P. 11.
were no Miſrepreſenters: Nor the *Jews* againſt our *Saviour*; nor *Infidels* againſt the *Apoſtles* and *Chriſtians*; nor ſhall any be *excluded from a ſhare in this Favour*, but they that have *Malice enough to Calumniate, but want Wit to give a Reaſon for what they do*, &c. So much was the *Repreſenter* overcome with *pure good Nature*, that for *Peace* ſake he would *yield* to a Principle that can do ſuch things as theſe, if his Word may be taken for the Reaſon; but we have another Reaſon in the Wind preſently; For if this ſame Principle which he has ordered to protect the lewdeſt *Defamations and Perjuries*, will but do its Office upon the Church of *England*, he has had his Reward: And ſo he ſhews what execution he can do in the Mouth of ſome *Zealous Brother*, whoſe *Honour and Intereſt engages him* to ſet out the Church of *England*, as we Repreſent the Church of *Rome*: To

which Purpoſe he puts a Sermon into his Mouth, which whether it be a Copy or an Original, the Diſſenters may ſay when they pleaſe. But the Heads of it are ſuch as theſe,

After a ſolemn Preface of Exhortation to keep out of the *Swing* and the *Sweep of the Dragons Tail*, he
P. 13, 14. lays down his Doctrine, That the *Church of England Mens Marks* are the *Marks* of the *Beaſt*, which he proves by the *large Revenues* and *State* of their *Pre-*
P. 15. *lates*, who wear the *Miter* and the *Croſier* upon their *Coaches* while they *Live*, and upon their *Tombs* when
P. 16. they are *Dead*: By the *Weekly Bill* of *London*, which ſhews that *Mary* has *Nineteen* Churches, and *Chriſt* but *Three*; by the *Pictures* in their *Bibles* and *Com-mon-Prayer-Books*; and by many other Marks as good
P. 17, 18, &c. as theſe; which becauſe they ſtick faſt to us, as he thinks, for any thing the *Anſwerer* has ſaid, muſt come over again in another place, and therefore the leſs Repetition ſhall ſerve now.

Sermon being done, he asks whether this be *Miſrepreſenting in a ſtrict and proper Senſe*; and if
P. 34. not, he is contented that the Word *Miſrepreſenting* in his Book ſhould not be taken ſo, *i. e.* for downright Lying; but, as we heard before, for *wry Interpreta-tions*, *weak Reaſonings*, &c. And here ends the *Ami-cable Accommodation.*

For his *picking up New Miſrepreſentations*, he ſays he did it to ſhew that the former were not his *own childiſh Conceits*: For leaving out the *Authorities* of the *Arch-Biſhop* of *York*; that this *makes nothing againſt him*, becauſe *the Queſtion is not*, *What ſome*
P. 35. *private Authors ſay*; *but*, *What the Church believes*;
P. 36. whoſe *Faith cannot be fairly Repreſented* from their Books

Books though *publiſhed by the Authority of Superiours*: For producing what *Sutcliff* laid to their Charge, without producing his *Reaſons*; that his Reaſons were *none* of the *Repreſenters concern*, becauſe they *nothing belong to Repreſenting*, nor has the *Anſwerer put his Approbation to them.* P. 37.

He charges the *Anſwerer* with leaving out *propter Deum* in a Citation out of the *Pontifical*, and this becauſe the Words were not for his purpoſe.

In Concluſion, he is reſolved not Diſpute, ſince the *Anſwerer knows no Reaſon for all this Diſpute*, p. 26. and he cares not whether the *Anſwerer likes his Religion or not*; *He will be no other than a Repreſenter ſtill*; *for We wiſe Converts do not love to go out of our way*, *but upon very good Grounds*: *The Biſhop of Condom has undertaken his own Vindication*; and if he does but come off as well as the *Repreſenter*, and 'tis ſtrange if he ſhould not, let *Bellarmine and other Eminent Approved Authors* ſay what they can, he has *no Concern in it*, but his Repreſentation, and the Biſhops Expoſition, are the *Authentick Rule* for the *Expoſition* of the Council of *Trent*; for the embracing the Catholick Faith, as *Expounded* by one, and *Propoſed* by the other, is ſufficient for a Perſon to be received into the Communion of their Church. P. 38. P. 39. P. 40.

We are now coming to the Foot of the Account; for beſides other Particulars of leſs moment that are dropt,

1. Whereas his only Reply to the clear and particular Diſtinctions of his *Anſwerer* between

Matters of Repreſentation, and Matters of Diſpute, was this, That theſe Matters did not, and could not lye in Vulgar Heads, with that Diſtinction; his Defence of that Reply, and conſequently of his confuſed and deceitful way of Repreſenting, is wholly Dropt.

2. The Defence of his Arguments, That the *Depoſing Power* is no Article of Faith; is now at laſt wholly Dropt.

3. His Defence of the *Worſhip of Images*, againſt his Adverſary's Diſcourſe, is Dropt; or to uſe his own Words, he *took the Freedom gravely to turn over his Anſwerers Occaſional Pages about it.* P. 39.

And now if the Reader will pleaſe to put all together, he will find by an eaſie Computation, That this was the poor Remainder of a Controvetſie begun by the *Repreſenter* upon no leſs than Thirty Seven Articles: So that theſe Points having had the hard Fate to be ſerved by the *Repreſenter* as their Fellows were before, I reckon that he has Dropt and Dropt, till the whole Cauſe is Dropt at laſt; but this is one of thoſe Things in which he is *not concerned*; for though the *Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented*, be in a very forſaken Condition, yet himſelf, the *Repreſenter*, was never more diverting, nor in better Humour all his Life: And who can blame a Man for not being ſorry for what can ne're be helpt? And therefore ſince he ſped no better with his Grave Undertaking, it was not amiſs

to

to call a merry Cauſe, upon *Miſrepreſenting in a ſtrict and proper Sence*, and to bring in a *Phanatick* Repreſenting the *Church* of *England* in a Ridiculous Sermon.

The Fourth Anſwer to the Repreſenter, *being* An Anſwer to the Amicable Accommodation.

THE *Anſwerer* has no Reaſon to be diſpleaſed, that the *Repreſenter* now grants we do not *Miſrepreſent* the Papiſts in *a ſtrict and proper ſenſe*, viz. by Imputing ſuch Doctrines to them as they do not own. But he ſaies that the Deſign of the *Repreſenter* in his Firſt Book, was to perſwade our people that we were ſuch Miſrepreſenters; but that failing in the performance, he would now make good his Title of Miſrepreſenting in a *leſs proper ſenſe*, inaſmuch as he thinks we do unjuſtly condemn the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*. But why he ſhould tax us for this at all, the *Anſwerer* wonders, and that very juſtly, one would think, becauſe the *Repreſenter* has ſometime ſince diſclaimed Diſputing, without which it cannot be ſeen whether we be Miſrepreſenters or not in this *leſs proper ſenſe*: And therefore he tells him, That if he will vindicate the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, he muſt *quit his retreat of Character-making*, and fall to *Diſputing* as their Fathers did; in which, he is ready to joyn iſſue with them: But that it

P. 4.

P. 6.

P. 8.

it was by no means civil to charge us with *Lying*, how prudent ſoever it might be upon another account, ſince if he proceeds in this way, he may be ſecure, that no civil perſon will care to diſpute with him. Now whereas the *Repreſenter* did in effect recall his grant, by attempting to prove largely, That there may be a Miſrepreſentation where there is an Agreement about the matter of Fact; becauſe there may be Miſpreſentation upon other accounts, *viz.* in reſpect of *Motive*, *Circumſtance*, *Intention*, *End*, &c. Here the *Anſwerer* ſhews that theſe things do indeed belong to true Repreſenting; but that they were too nicely diſtinguiſhed by the *Repreſenter* from matter of Fact; for he had given him no occaſion for the Diſtinction, ſince he had conſidered theſe things in thoſe matters which he charged upon the Church of *Rome*; For Inſtance, That not only Worſhipping of Images, but the Worſhippers *Intentions*, and all other circumſtances, without which the Nature of the Fact cannot be throughly underſtood, were taken into conſideration. Then he ſhews through all the *Repreſenter's* Inſtances, That
P. 12. the Miſrepreſentations were in Matters of Fact; but wonders why he did not produce one Inſtance of the like nature out of his Anſwers, if he thought there were any. For what could he gain by ſhewing, That in ſuch and ſuch caſes others have been Miſrepreſenters, unleſs he proved withal, that we were Miſrepreſenters in like caſes? His inſtances ſhew, that they who tell a piece of a Story, may Miſrepreſent; but not that they do ſo, who faithfully relate the whole matter of Fact,

with

with all its circumſtances; which is our caſe; and he has not produced one example to the contrary; tho ſo to have done, had been more to his purpoſe, than all his other Inſtances. In ſhort, this matter was ſo fully Anſwered, that when we hear next of the *Repreſenter*, we do not find one word more about it.

To the *Zealous Brothers* Harangue, he ſaies, tho it be granted that the Diſſenters Miſrepreſent our Church, yet this does not prove that we Miſrepreſent the Church of *Rome*; and therefore this is nothing but a device to get rid of us, by throwing us upon the Diſſenters. But *we are not for purſuing every New Game, but will keep to our old ſcent.* And yet he has made the Diſſenter ſay ſuch ſilly things of us, as no Diſſenter will own, unleſs he has heard them among the Quakers. This the *Anſwerer* plainly ſhewed through almoſt all his Fifteen particulars of the Charge againſt the Church of *England*, and by the way, where it was any thing needful, he taxed the unreaſonableneſs and folly of the Charge, which yet was more than he was bound to; ſince if it came to the Trial, we have ſome reaſon to think that there is not a zealous *Brother* in *England*, no nor *Friend* neither, but would be aſhamed to own it. So that this deſign of *Repreſenting* and *Miſrepreſenting*, to which I may add the *Repreſenter*'s yielding in pure good Nature, that henceforth *Miſrepreſenting* ſhall be underſtood in its *leſs proper ſenſe*, *ends only in Ridiculing the Church of* England, with which we are content, *if they will permit us truly to Repreſent theirs.*

15. P

P. 16.

To

To what the *Repreſenter* offered, for ſeeking out new Miſrepreſentations, the ſum of what is Anſwered, is this, That it is in the main agreed what the matters of Fact are with which the Papiſts may be charged; and ſince theſe only are the proper Subject of Repreſentation, the ill conſequences which Proteſtants have urged againſt their Doctrines and Practices, ought not to have been put into the
P. 24. *Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented*, unleſs he could ſhew, that we ſay that Papiſts do believe thoſe Conſequences: And therefore the *Repreſenter* vainly endeavours to excuſe himſelf for putting them into that Character, by hunting about for new pretended Miſrepreſentations, to imploy his *Anſwerer* withal. This I gather to be the *Anſwerer*'s ſenſe, from his reference to what he had proved before.

As to the Archbiſhop of *York*; the *Anſwerer* ſaies, he did not Miſrepreſent the Church of *Rome*
P. 25. in ſaying that *Stapleton* ſaid, *We muſt ſimply believe the Church of* Rome *whether it Teach True or Falſe*. The moſt that can be made of it, is, That according to one of their allowed Doctors, Thus a Papiſt muſt believe. And therefore if it be a Miſrepreſentation of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, *Stapleton* is to be thanked for it in the firſt place, for ſaying ſo; and in the next, the Church of *Rome* for allowing him to ſay ſo; and then the Arch-Biſhop for reporting what he ſaid, tho he does not ſay that one Doctor may make Doctrines for the Church of *Rome*.

The

The Caſe of Mr. *Sutcliff*, he ſays, is different; and he ſhews that he *expreſly diſtinguiſhes between what the Papiſts teach, and what himſelf concludes from ſuch Doctrines; and therefore that he does not Miſrepreſent the Papiſts.* So that how little ſoever the Repreſenter thought himſelf concerned in *Sutcliff*'s Reaſonings, becauſe Reaſoning belonged not to a Repreſenter; yet ſurely it belonged to a Repreſenter to diſtinguiſh between the Doctrines we charge upon the Papiſts on the one ſide, and the Arguments we bring againſt theſe Doctrines on the other. P. 26, 27.

To the Charge of omitting to render *propter Deum* into Engliſh; He ſays, It was omitted he knows not how or why; but very juſtly blames the Repreſenter for inſinuating that it was diſhoneſtly omitted, ſince it was the *whole Deſign of that Diſcourſe about the Worſhip of Images*, to ſhew that *Image Worſhip* is Evil, tho *God* was worſhipped by it. I will upon this occaſion add, that the Anſwerer could not but know his own foul Dealing in this Charge, which is ſo very manifeſt; that this Injuſtice, if there were nothing elſe, does aſſure me, that he muſt make another *Change*, before we can expect much ſincerity from him. P. 28.

With like honeſty, he diſingages himſelf from all Obligation to diſpute concerning the *Worſhip of Images*, &c. 1. Becauſe the Anſwerer *knows no Reaſon for all this Diſpute*; which words did not at all relate to that Diſpute, but to the Queſtion about the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Authority. 2. He *was never concerned whether the Anſwerer liked his Religion or not.* But if he could have anſwer'd that Diſcourſe, *all that the Anſwerer could have ſaid would not have hindred him.* P. 29.

For the Rest; the Answerer says, that the *Representer* and the Bishop of *Condom*, *reason'd* and *argued* at first, as well as *Represented*; and since their Representation is offer'd as a Rule by which we may be taken into the *Roman* Church, they were the more concern'd to *justify their own Reasonings*; which since it is declined, our People will be apt to *think why Papists decline the Dispute, who are never known to avoid Disputing, when they think they can get any thing by it.* *And thus* the Answerer *takes leave of the Representer*, believing that *this Matter is driven as far as it will go.*

P. 30.

The Fourth Reply of the Representer, in behalf of his Amicable Accommodation.

THis last Reply is made up;

1. Of insulting over the Answerer, for offering no more than he did in Answer to the Zealous Brother's Sermon against the Church of *England*.

2. Of more and more out-cries upon the Protestants for Misrepresenting the Papists.

But the Particulars that come under these Heads, together with his Reflections by the bye, will be best produced in the following Answer, where I shall consider what Reason he has for this kind of proceeding.

The

The Fifth Answer to the Representer in Return to his last Reply.

IF the *Seven and Thirty* lost Points had been recovered, the Representer could not have entered the Lists with more seeming satisfaction, in himself, than he shews in his last Reply. But he has made a shift to forget them, and that's as good. What the Answerer said, that *the Matter was driven as far as it would go* (whatever the Representer imagines) I find still to be true. For with reference to the chief matter of Dispute betwixt us, we are parted; and, I think, never like to meet any more about it. Indeed as to the *manifold Charge summed up against the Church of England, that matter*, as he truly observes, *is not driven as far as it will go*: And it seems he intends to *drive* it farther and farther. But why that should ever come to be a matter of Debate betwixt us, any one who considers the Controversy from first to last, must needs wonder.

The Design of what has been said on behalf of the Church of *England* has been to make evident these three Things.

1. That we do not charge the Papists with some things which the Representer will have us to charge them with.

2. That some things which he saith we falsly charge them with, are maintained and practised by them.

3. That allowing them to maintain and practise only, what themselves acknowledg that they do maintain and practise, yet there are sufficient Reasons

why we cannot comply with Popery, altho refined after the newest Fashion.

This is the sum of what has been argued on our side. Now how comes his *Zealous Brother's* Cant to be an Answer to all this? I know not I must confess how to imagine any Dissenter to be so ridiculous as to object against us, what the Representer makes him to Object: And without *Flattery* or *Fawning*, I may safely affirm that there are not many who do it. But suppose there should; will such their Objections prove against the First particular above mentioned, that *we charge Papists with what we deny we charge them with?* Or against the Third, That *allowing them to maintain and practise, what themselves acknowledg that they maintain and practise, we ought to comply with Popery.* I think that no Man in his Wits will assert this. And therefore we may justly ask what is to be done with all that has been said upon these particulars? and whether there not having been any thing that is material urged against them, does not imply that there is nothing material to be urged; and consequently, if the Answerer had not some Reason to say, that *the matter was driven as far as it will go?*

As to the second particular, *viz.* that several things which we are said falsly to charge them with, are maintained and defended by them; This indeed the Character which he made, *little more than in Jest*, for his Zealous Brother, doth seem more directly to oppose. And yet it might be easily answered, that this *Brother* in his Zeal might urge what was *False* against *Us*, tho we urged nothing but what was *True* against the *Papists*. Which with a great deal more the *Answerer* offered to the consideration of the *Representer*; and he is now told that he *passed over* this same charge

charge upon the Church of *England*, with *a Light Touch*, &c. And much adoe there is, because he was *not for pursuing every new Game, but for keeping to the old Scent.* For what could possibly come more cross to the *Representer*, than that after all his Doubling and Shifting, he should start *new Game* for us, and yet we should be for *keeping to the old Scent?* And therefore I do not wonder to hear him complaining in this manner. *And is it possible then that the Disputing humour is so soon off? We have heard of nothing hitherto so much as of Disputes——and yet the Answerer is as unwilling to Dispute as the Representer——Here's not a word now of Disputing——And is it not strange that he should draw me out to Dispute——and when his own Turn comes of Disputing he should let the matter Fall, because, forsooth, he'll keep to his old Scent?* P. 3, 4.

Now really this would almost perswade a Man to let him go for good and all; as he might have done if he had observed but a little moderation. But he gives it out, that in his *Brother*'s Character of the Church of *England*, *Almost every Point is urged with the same Proofs of Scripture and Reason, which Protestants produce against the Papists: That there is scarce an Argument in the Character, but is exactly parallel to what the Church of* England *uses in her Defence against Popery; that the Grounds of the Arguments are the same, the manner of urging them the same, the Maxims on which they stand the same, and then the Reasons which press them home, are they not the very same which the Answerer himself in his former Discourse urges against him?* And he turns it upon his Answerer, That *a little prudence would serve him to say nothing in such a Cause as will admit no better a Defence.* This I must needs say, is a little too tyranni-

cal

cal in a Representer under his Circumstances; and would tempt a Man against his own Inclinations to follow him a little farther now, under his new Shape.

I tell him therefore, in the first place, that a close Disputant would have pressed him to shew, that the Reasons upon which we proceed in our manifold Charge against the Papists are false and unsatisfactory; and not have suffered him to run out into an Inquiry, whether the Reasons upon which his *Zealous Brother* proceeds against us, be the same with them, or no. Or, if this were to be allowed him, we might be well excused from answering him in this matter; since the particular Controversies which the Church of *England* hath with the Dissenters, have been managed on her behalf, not so long since that it should be forgotten; and the *difference of the Case* between the Separation of Protestants from the Church of *Rome*, and of Dissenters from the Church of *England*, was shewn after all, and that *in very good earnest*. For this being not taken notice of by the Representer, it might very well set off our Debt to him for a *Charge* upon the Church of *England*, which himself meant *little more than in jest*. Besides, altho he glories in this Charge more than in all his other Performances, yet since he frequently intimates, that he intended no more by it, than to *Ridicule* our Charge against the Church of *Rome*, 'tis all one, as if he had given it under his hand, that his Cause is more safe by *ridiculing* what we say, than by *replying* to it like a Disputant. Now on the other hand, we think our Charge must needs have been carefully laid, and well defended, if at last it will admit of none but *Ridiculing Replies*: And so we might without

without much danger, leave things as they are, and put it to the venture, whether the World will not think so too. But because he boasts so very much, that this Discourse which he has composed for the *Brother*, is not yet sufficiently answered, and as some think, he may grow a little popular by it; I care not if I go on with him in some part of his own way; and, in compliance with the Opinion of others, inquire into the difference of those Objections upon which we proceed against the Church of *Rome*, from those upon which *his zealous Brother* proceeds against the Church of *England*.

1. I grant that *our Prelates* have *Revenues*, and I believe *Coaches*, *Miters*, *Crosiers* and *Copes*. Now if there be any reason why his *Brother* calls these *Popish*, 'tis this, that these things were not in use in *our Saviour's, and in the Apostles times*. But when did we ever object against any thing that is meerly *circumstantial* amongst them (as these things are) that it was not used in our Saviour's, or in his Apostles Times? Have we not said it a thousand times, that we like nothing the worse because the Papists approve it, provided it be useful; nay, if it be innocent and harmless? As for their *Ornaments* and *Ceremonies*, where does any one find that in the Controversies now on foot betwixt us, we do at all insist upon them? Tho we cannot but think many of them to be neither grave nor decent, their Number too great, and too much Religion placed in them by some People. So that, tho *there is scarce an Argument in the Character, but exactly parallel to what we use*, and tho *ALMOST EVERY Point is urged with the same Proofs*, &c. yet surely the first *Point* is none of them. And therefore let's try the next.

2. It

2. It is objected against us, that *we make Gods of dead Men*, and this is proved by the *weekly Bills of Mortality*, where our Churches are called by the same *Titles* that they had in times of Popery. Now if by *making Gods of dead Men*, be meant making the Saints so many Independent Deities, there is then a great deal of difference between what the *Zealous Brother* objects against us, and what *We* object against the Papists, as well as between the Reasons of our Objections: For we never object this against them. But if by this Expression be meant, giving that Worship to the Saints, which belongs only to God and our Saviour; we then allow our Objection to be the same, but do think that we have much better Reasons to object this against the Papist, than that of a *weekly Bill of Mortality*. For we appeal to the *Publick Addresses* which are made to the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints, with all the Circumstances of External Adoration; to their *Litanies* and to the *Hymns* of their establish'd Offices, wherein they are often invoked after the same manner, as God himself is; to their appropriating to particular Saints, distinct Powers of doing good to their Worshippers; to their Acknowledgment, that the Saints are Mediators of Intercession; to the Prayers that are made to them in all places, as if they were omnipresent; to the Sense also of their Council of *Trent*, that they are to be prayed unto with *mental* as well as *vocal* Prayer, as if they knew our Hearts. All which I hope is something more than that in the *weekly Bill of Mortality*, and in common Conversation, we call our Temples by the same Names they formerly had. And yet the Representer asks, *Wherein have I Ridiculed the Church of* England? *I have done no more in my*

Cha-

Character againſt her, then what they have been doing theſe hundred and fifty Years againſt the Church of Rome? ſo that it ſeems we have for *theſe hundred and fifty Years* charged them with *Worſhipping* the Saints upon no better grounds then their *weekly Bills of Mortality*. *Only*, ſaith he, *what I have done in a kind of jeſt, and without endeavouring to delude any body with ſuch kind of Sophiſtry, they have been doing in the greateſt earneſt, and by it making good their Cauſe.* So that he confeſſes his Charge upon our Church to be carried on with a *kind of Sophiſtry*: only what he has done *in a kind of jeſt*, we have been doing againſt them *in the greateſt earneſt*; i. e. we have in *good earneſt* charged the Church of *Rome* with giving that Worſhip to Saints which belongs to God only, upon nothing elſe but the *Titles* of Churches, ſuch as ours have in the *Bills of Mortality*. But ſurely his greateſt *Sophiſtry* of all lies in this, that he *endeavours to delude* People into this Opinion, which yet if he could, he muſt delude them into another Opinion too, that *Bellarmin* and all the famous Champions of old Popery, were a company of Fools, to be at ſo much *Sweat* and *Charges* to maintain the *Worſhip of Saints*, and to defend it, as they have done, when they could ſo eaſily have denied it. For that nothing is eaſier than to make good our diſowning it againſt the ground upon which he charges us with it, I ſhall preſently make appear.

To let paſs his Suggeſtion, that the *London Churches were firſt built by the Papiſts*; his adding that we *rebuilt them, with the ſame Titles, Invocations and Dedications which they uſe*, ſhews how little he is to be truſted in a Queſtion of Antiquity, who talks ſo careleſly of things that are notorious in our own

Days. Our Fathers indeed found the *Titles* convenient enough, and the *Churches* themselves reasonable good Churches, and retain'd them both. But when we *raised them out of their Ashes*, we *dedicated* them to no Saint, whatever has been done in this kind formerly; nor have we since *invocated* any Saint in any one of them, but we keep the *Titles* still. And does our new Representer expect that we should Answer such Objections as these? At least I desire him not to think that we will make a practice of it. Must our retaining these Titles, necessarily infer a virtual Dedication of our Temples to those Saints, by whose Names they are distinguished from one another? But what if we had called them by the Names of those *Streets* only where they stand, had they then been *dedicated to the Honour* of the Streets? We say that the *Hundred Thirty and Two* Churches here, which are known by the Names of *dead Men and Women*, are with us *God's Houses*, and dedicated to his only Service, no less than the *Five* that are distinguished by the Names of *Christ* and the *Trinity*. And methinks so acute a Disputant as he is grown, might have seen that the Title of one Church distinguishing it from the rest, does not shew who is served and worshipped there, when the same Service and Worship is used in all of them. That which we blame them for is, that they continue to worship *Dead Men and Women* in those Churches which bear their Names, and in those which do not. For if in *Christ's Church* they call upon the Blessed Virgin; tho the Church has its *Title* from *Christ*, yet 'tis a *House of Prayer* to Her as well as to Him. And if in the Churches which are known by her Name, we call upon *God only*, and worship him *alone*,

alone, they are *his Houſes* intirely, and none of Hers. But after all, where does the Anſwerer preſs him with the *Titles* of their Churches? *And yet the Reaſons which preſs home the Arguments, are they not the very ſame which the Anſwerer himſelf urges againſt him the Repreſenter?*

3. I confeſs that I have ſeen *Pictures* in ſome *Engliſh Bibles* and *Common-prayer Books*, and *Moſes* and *Aaron* painted on *each ſide of the Commandments* upon ſome of our Altar-pieces; which things how they have crept in amongſt us I cannot tell, for they have no publick Authority from our Church. The Anſwerer made his gueſs, and perhaps it will not be eaſy to mend it. But upon this great Occaſion, the Repreſenter has brought in his *Rigid* Brother making us worſe than the Papiſts themſelves, forgetting that he undertook to repreſent us not altogether ſo Bad, and therefore he ſhould at leaſt have corrected himſelf in this manner; "Indeed, Beloved, I told ye at "firſt, that theſe *Church-of-England*-Men are with-"in the *Swing of the Dragon's Tail*; but I had not lied "to ſay that they are under the *Feet* and the *Belly*, "more than the *Papiſts* themſelves are. For the Pa-"piſts do no more towards the *placing of Image*-Wor-"ſhip in the *Word of God*, than by a cleanly con-"veyance of that Commandment which forbids it, "out of the way. But theſe Church-of-*England*-Men, "*as they are called, have given that Abomination of* "*Images themſelves, a place in every Leaf of their Bible,* "*in the very Word of God; which is the greateſt Ar-*"*gument of Soveraign Honour.* Nay, in ſome of "their Bibles you ſhall find *Moſes* and *Aaron* ſtand in "the very next Leaf to the *Ten Commandments*;

" which what is it, Beloved, but a *Defiance* to the *Se-*
" *cond?* Whereas the *Papists* being more modest than
" to affront it, have put it away far from them. *But*
" *this is not all, my Brethren, for they pray to their*
" *Pictures; for if you but look over their Shoulders,*
" *you'l see their Pictures in the very heat of their De-*
" *votion, under their very Eyes, in the Leaves of their*
" *Common-Prayer Books; And therefore, mark me now*
" *Beloved, if we must believe our own Senses, they pray*
" *to the Pictures,* and to the Leaves, and to the Idol
" Common-Prayer Books and all.

This indeed had been something like, and would have pieced well with what follows, that our *Altars have their Images too, and that in a more profane way than the Papists,* &c.

Well; but let us suppose our Church bound to answer for these *Pictures,* and for *Moses* and *Aaron,* &c. Are we enjoyned to pay them any Worship, as they of the Romish Communion are obliged to pay to their Images? The Council of *Trent* has determined, *That due Honour and Veneration must be given to Images, and that the Honour which is given to them is referred to the Things which they represent.* Has the Church of *England* done any thing like this? We read of several Prayers used at the *Consecration* of Images amongst them: But whoever heard of any such thing practised at the setting up of *Moses* and *Aaron?* We know that they walk many Miles in Pilgrimage to particular Images, and that they think much more good is to be expected from some, than from others: But who ever thought so among us, or imagined that the Pictures of *Moses* and *Aaron* in *Cornhill,* were more to be honoured than those in *Woodstreet,*

Woodſtreet, or in any other place? So that how ſilly ſoever the *Zealous Brother* may appear to be in imputing to us, upon ſuch frivolous grounds, the worſhip of Images; I am ſure that he who made the Harangue for him, is either much more ſo, or ſomething that is worſe, in pretending that when we urge the ſame againſt the Papiſts, the Reaſons we go upon are no better than his.

But we do at leaſt *make Images* and *Pictures*, which the *ſecond Commandment expreſly forbids*, as he makes his Brother ſay. And now a Reaſon of the Anſwerer is produced, that *no Intention can alter the nature of Actions which are determined by a Divine Law.* I would therefore know of him, whether there be, or be not good reaſon to make us certain, that the ſecond Commandment does not abſolutely forbid the making of Images and Pictures, but only with reference to worſhipping them. If there be no good Reaſon for it, let him then tell me, whether any Intention can juſtify the making of Images againſt an abſolute Law to the contrary. If there be, let him then but confeſs what he thinks of this Objection that he has put into his Brother's Mouth, and there's one labour ſaved.

I confeſs, it were not ill for him if ſome *Intention* might juſtify the breaking of the ninth Commandment; for he pretends that the *New* Common-Prayer-Books do not *profeſs that hatred* to *Image-Worſhip*, which the *Old* ones did: When in the *Commination* to which he refers, the very firſt inſtance runs thus, *Curſed is the Man that maketh any carved or molten Image to worſhip it.* Does he think that his *Diſſenting Brother* muſt anſwer for theſe things.

4. Neither

4. Neither is he more Juſt to us in making his *Zealous Brother* to object againſt us that we *worſhip Saints and Angels.* For, to paſs by the Argument about *erecting Temples to them*, to which we have already ſpoken; Is our giving Thanks to God upon *ſet Days* for ſuch eminent Examples of Faith and Vertue, as the firſt Propagators of the Goſpel were? Is our commemorating their Patience, and all their other Divine Graces, to excite one another to the Imitation of them? Is our Praying to God that we may be Followers of them, who through Faith and Patience inherit the Promiſes? Is this, I ſay, any thing like to what the Council of *Trent* declares, That *they think wickedly who deny that Saints are to be Invoked?* Is it of the ſame nature with owning them to be *Mediators of Interceſſion*, the ſame with putting up to them that ſort of Petitions which are fit to be offered to God only? Or does our Praying upon St. *Michael*'s Day, that by *God's appointment his holy Angels may ſuccour and defend us*, come near even ſo much as to one ſingle *Holy Michael Pray for us?* which Form of Words, tho much inferiour to what is ſometimes uſed in the Church of *Rome*, we never dare to venture upon, becauſe we cannot make Addreſſes either to him, or to any other Angel or Saint, but by interpretation we muſt aſcribe the Divine Attribute of *Omnipreſence* to them, and for many other Reaſons, which yet we have not been able to get an Anſwer to from theſe Men. But he ſays that we *Pray* on St. *Michael*'s Day, *as if God were not able to defend us, and therefore we ſeek ſhelter under the Angel's Wings:* And this ſurely is to *worſhip Angels.* By like reaſon if we pray for

for our *Daily Bread*, we pray as if God were not able to preserve us without it: And this would be to worship Bread. The Representer makes too bold with his *Zealous Brother*, and with us too, if he would have it thought that we reason against them at this rate. But by this time I hope he sees to how little purpose he applies that of the Answerer to this matter, *viz.* that *All worship of Invisible Beings is Religious Worship, &c.* For as yet he has not proved that we *worship* Saints or Angels; and if he has done his best towards it here, I will be bold to say, that he knows he cannot prove it against us; as we can against them, if there were any need of it: But there is no need of it, because they confess it.

5. As for what is objected about our *Idolatry in Receiving the Sacrament*; if I did not know the Prompter, I should be ashamed to find it amongst such Instances as are said to be *built upon the same Maxims*, that our Objections against the Papists are. For how far soever *We* and the *Zealous Brother* might in other cases be said to agree in the Reasons of what we Object; I am sure it is most unreasonable to say we agree in this. For do we, as the Papists, hold that the Bread and Wine are changed into the natural Body and Blood of Christ? Do we require any worship to be paid to the Elements after Consecration? Do we elevate or carry them about, on purpose to have them adored by the People? Nay, with reference to our receiving the same in the posture of *Kneeling*, is it not as fully as can be declared, *That that posture is meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ to all worthy Receivers*; *That no Adoration is hereby intended*,

tended, for that the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural Subſtances, and the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour are in Heaven and not here? Which Declaration is the more ſignificant, one would think, as being made by our Church in Oppoſition to thoſe who *do Adore* the Sacrament: Eſpecially ſince it was not the poſture of *Kneeling* when the *Sacrament* is received, which of it ſelf could make ſuch a Declaration needful, but the Scandal which they give to the World who Adore it. Had this been conſidered by the Repreſenter, his Brothers *Zeal* might well have been ſpared in ſaying, *They may ſay, they do not pay Religious Worſhip to the Bread and Wine, and Honour the Sacrament as God: But what, muſt we not believe our ſenſes in ſo plain a Caſe?* Or elſe his Zeal ſhould not have ſtopt here, but carried him a little farther, to appeal to his *own Eyes* that we honour the *Patin* and *Chalice* as Gods too, by *falling down to them on our Knees*, for this is as *plain a Caſe* as the other; and our Church has made no *Declaration* againſt it in ſolemn and particular Terms neither, as it has againſt the *Adoration* of the *Bread* and the *Wine*. But I gueſs that the *Zealous Brother* when he is once at liberty to ſpeak for himſelf, will confeſs that he *ſees* neither the one nor the other; and that it is no affront to his *Eyes* to acquit us of Adoring the Sacrament, and to yield that when we receive it, we Adore God and him only, in a poſture which as we think, well becomes the thankful Receivers of ſuch Holy Myſteries.

However, tho we, it ſeems, muſt not be believed when we ſay that *we do not adore* the Sacrament at all; yet we will not be ſo hard to the Church of *Rome*,

Rome, but believe her telling us that ſhe *does Adore* the Sacrament, and that *with Divine Honour too*. And when the *Zealous Brother* gets our Church at any Advantage like this, or can find out any practices amongſt us like thoſe above mentioned, we ſhall hear him, I doubt not, ſpeaking to better purpoſe for himſelf, than as his *Brother* here has taught him.

And now, I think, I have omitted nothing in the firſt *Five* of the *Fifteen Parallels*, that required the leaſt notice, but have rather ventured being laugh'd at by the Repreſenter for giving any ſerious Anſwers, where he meant only to *Ridicule*. But by this he may ſee what little reaſon there was to Crow over his Adverſary as he does upon this occaſion; which was all that I intended. And therefore ſince it is needleſs to *drive* the *Parallel* any farther with that circumſtance which I have hitherto uſed; I muſt not do a needleſs thing, which according to one of his weighty Obſervations, *would be Six-pence a piece more for the Curious*: Eſpecially ſince the Anſwerer has done Reaſon enough to the remaining Particulars. For tho the Repreſenter, to ſave himſelf from any further Reply, comes off with telling him that he anſwered the whole charge with, *The Diſſenters never charged us with this or that, &c.* and nothing elſe; yet the Reader will find more ſaid than this comes to, if he will conſult the Anſwer it ſelf, inſtead of taking the Repreſenters word. But I hope *Five* of his Particulars have been handled his own way: And now I offer him this, either in full Satisfaction, or in part of Payment; let him chuſe, as he likes, 'tis all one to his Humble Servant. And therefore if he will pleaſe to call upon me for Arrears, I promiſe him

that our *calling upon the Birds, the Beasts, and the Fishes*, shall not be forgotten, nor *our crying out to Dead Men, in our most solemn Devotion*, nor the *Apochrypha* in the *Liturgy*, nor the *Rochet*, the *Alb*, and the *Tunicle*, nor any thing else which yet wants a *Vindication*, as he says: But, to return him one of his familiar Phrases, I shall *take occasion of playing him the same Tune over again as distinctly* upon the remaining *Ten*, as he has had it already upon his first *Five* Particulars.

And now let us go on with his Reply; in which the next thing I observe, is, that he will needs have the Answerer to *bid fair for the good opinion* of Dissenters, and *to curry closely with the* Dissenters, and to
Pag. 5. *throw those scandals upon his own Church in good earnest, which the Representer did little more than in jest.* If the Representer could have turned his Adversaries Pen against the *Dissenters*, there are some would have had a better opportunity of *currying closely with the Dissenters*; and I shall tell him who they are, before I have done with him. But, it seems, we are not for doing every good thing, in the very nick when he would have it done. And so to be revenged on us, we must be represented as *currying with the Dissenters*; which yet we are as far from, when we own our Agreement with them in those many things, which they no less than we, object against the Papists; as from *currying with the Papists*, when we confess that we agree with them in those fewer things that are to be objected against the Dissenters. And yet *currying* with the Dissenters is not so great a Fault, but he could tell them upon the Spot, how their Sufferings are at an end, *now our Churches power has been*

some

ſomething check'd, which he thinks they may *Reflect upon*. But if the Repreſenter would win their good opinion, he ſhould of all things beware of putting them in mind to *Reflect*; leſt when they begin to Reflect upon thoſe things of which he ſpeaks, they ſhould chance to Reflect upon other things of which he ſpeaks not. Pag. 5.

Methinks too, I may reaſonably ſuſpect a little currying of the Repreſenter in what comes next. For, whereas the Anſwerer thought the Diſſenters *too wiſe and cautious to take Characters* [of us] *from* [Their own] *open and profeſſed Enemies*; (for that was his plain meaning) the Repreſenter underſtands him, as if he had meant *our*, *i. e.* the Church of *Englands profeſt Enemies*: and then hopes that our People will henceforth be ſo wiſe, as not to take Characters of Popery from us, who are, as he ſays, *Enemies* to Papiſts. But whether he was reſolved to make this miſtake for the ſake of the neat Turn, or to ſave himſelf from ſaying whether he was *Friend* or *Enemy* to the Diſſenters, I leave him to reſolve. But I hope he does not expect that I ſhould take notice of every ſuch little Reflection, as he knows this to be. Pag. 6.

And yet I muſt needs vindicate the Anſwerer from that Charge, that whereas the Repreſenter granted, that his Proteſtant Character of a Papiſt was not made up *wholly* of down-right Lies, the Anſwerer *ſtretches this Courteſy with a witneſs*, and concludes that we have the Repreſenter's word for it now that we are guilty of no Miſrepreſentation at all of matters of Fact, which he, the Repreſenter, never did, nor will allow. But in this the Anſwerer is wronged, who very well remembred, that his Ad- Pag. 9. Pag. 10.

versary did a little dispute his Churches owning the *Deposing Power*, and two or three Points more, which he thought fit to drop at last. Now therefore, as the Answerer had frequently said before, that the matters of Fact were the same in both Characters, *very few things excepted*; so in his last Answer, he was to be understood in course with the same Exception, *viz.* that we now had our Adversaries Confession, that in the Character of a Misrepresented Papist, there were no Protestant Misrepresentations of Popery properly so called; and so, that a very few Points excepted, we are agreed on both sides upon the matters of Fact. And this one would think was plain enough in the last Answer, where the Answerer thus interprets the Concession of his Adversary. *Whatever he at first pretended, he grants now, that we are not in a strict and proper sense Misrepresenters; and thus farewel to Character-making, since Papists and Protestants that understand these matters, are in the main* (not absolutely in every point, but in the main) *agreed what is the Character of a Papist, tho they differ in their Opinions about him,* &c.

Answ. to Am. Accom. p. 8, 9.

I know indeed the Representer would extend the *down-right Lies*, from which he does not absolutely acquit us, to more Instances than those excepted by the Answerer. For which he appeals to his own Character of a Papist misrepresented, where he has represented the Protestants as Liars, in charging the Papists with other things disowned by the Church of *Rome*: Which is one of the finest Fetches that is possible. For tho in that Character, he has made the Protestant to charge the Papist with all that we indeed charge him with; yet he has made him do more,

Pag. 11.

more, and therefore might safely appeal to his own Character, to prove that we are *Liars* in *some* things; always supposing that he is the honestest Man in the World, in representing the Protestant Representations of Popery. But how often must he be told, that he has been a false Representer of us as to this matter? That he sometimes brings in Protestants charging Papists, (1.) In ambiguous Terms, which admit of different Interpretations; for instance, under the Head of *Praying to Images*, which is the first Point he mentions. (2.) With owning the dangerous Consequences of their Doctrines and Practices, as that Papists *do believe their Sins to be infalliby remitted upon Absolution, whether they resolve upon Amendment or no:* which is his second Instance, and there are two or three more, to the same Tune. (3.) With some things that we do not impute to 'em at all, either as Principles or Consequences; witness that Instance which he has the fore-head still to insist upon. *For*, says he, *Are their Sermons in Latin? Do they teach in unknown Tongues?* as if we charged them with this. I know not what every Protestant in the World may have said in his heat against Papists: But I am apt to think that it will be as hard to find a Protestant that hath said this against them, as to find a *Zealous Brother* that will own the Canting Sermon he hath made against us. Upon one or other of these three accounts he might well appeal to his own Characters to convict us of Lying, and ask the Answerer *what he thinks* of this, or that which Protestants charge upon Papists; supposing, as I said before, that he delivers *Oracles* always, when he is setting us out to the World.

And

And now, I say, 'tis too late for the Representer to ask us, *what we think* of these things; because, not to mention the second Answer, his first Answerer has told him very particularly what *we think* of them, what we do charge them with, and what not. And since he has said nothing to it, it is unreasonable to expect that we should do the same thing over and over again, as often as he is pleased to put the Question to us. As for *firing the City*, and *killing* Sir *Edmund-Bury Godfrey*, &c. what have these things to do in the Character of Popery? I suppose 'tis no Article of the Representer's Faith, that Papists did not these things; I am sure 'tis none of mine, that they did.

Having upon no better grounds than these accused the Answerer of Misrepresenting him, he runs out into general and passionate Expostulations concerning the injustice of those who *for their own Interest* support the false Notions which the People have of Popery, lest *themselves should appear the Deceivers*. At length he asks, whether altho *the People must be preached into a Dread of Popery, it be a Christian Method to make use of Artifices to encrease*
Pag. 12. *the Horror? Why should every thing the Papists do be stretch'd and strain'd, and forc'd to make it ugly?*—*'Tis true, this is proper enough to win upon the Mobile, who make no distinction between Real and Artificial Monsters; 'tis well enough, where the Interest is best maintain'd by the madness of the People. But where's the Christianity all the while, where's Truth and Charity?* Why truly not so much as there should be, where either these things are done on the one side, or falsly said to be done on the other. Now it must not be quite forgotten that the Representer wrote

wrote his Proteſtant Characters of Popery, as they lay in his own and the Peoples Heads; and made all his Anſwerers work in diſtinguiſhing between *Repreſentation* and *Diſpute*; between Principles that are *owned*, and Conſequences that are *denied* by the Papiſts, utterly uſeleſs; becauſe things did not and could not lie thus diſtinctly in the *Peoples* Heads. For Inſtance, Becauſe if a Preacher ſhould ſay, that though the Papiſts think it lawful to worſhip Images, yet it is plainly forbidden in God's Word ſo to do, and that too as an Idolatrous Action; the poor People preſently conclude, that the Papiſts believing it to be Idolatry, differ from us in no other thing, but that we think Idolatry, and forbidden Worſhip, to be unlawful, and the Papiſts do not think ſo. But if the Repreſenter believed this of the People; *Where was Chriſtianity, where was Truth and Charity*, when he wrote his Repreſentation of Popery, under colour of diſabuſing the People; and made one part of a Papiſt's Character to be this, that he abhors Idolatry? for thus the People would be betrayed into a belief, that he does not ſo much as worſhip Images; for *Conſequents* and *Antecedents* are ſo jumbled in the Peoples Heads, that nothing can *lie diſtinctly* there. We indeed do not think ſo meanly of them, and therefore might honeſtly urge *Arguments* and *Conſequences* againſt that and other *Practices* of the *Roman* Church. But he, it ſeems, believed they could not diſtinguiſh between the one and the other; and then I am ſure if they acquitted Papiſts of the *Conſequence*, it would go hard if they did not acquit them of the *Fact* too; and therefore whether he put the Denying of the Conſequence

sequence into the Papist's Character with an honest Design, at least, whether he had any reason to object against the distinct proceeding of the Answerer, I dare almost now appeal to himself. But, as I observed before, the Answerer made him ashamed of imputing this kind of *madness* to the People, and so we heard no more of it in his next Reply. But yet the *Interest* we are said to have in the People, must still be imputed to their *madness*. And what *madness* is it now? Why they *cannot distinguish between Real and Artificial Monsters:* Which is as much as to say, that we have made the Papists *Monsters*, by telling notorious Lies of them; and the People are so mad that they cannot find it out. But may not I take my turn now to ask, *Where's Christianity all this while; where's Truth and Charity?* Why must we be branded with the Imputation of Falshood and Calumny, and our Christian Brethren treated in that manner, as if they were mere stupid Creatures, and more fit to herd with Beasts, than to live amongst Men?

As for our selves being thus urged, we beg leave to appeal to All that know us, whether this odious Character be any way suitable to our Conversation; and then, whether we have deserved it for the management of this Controversy in particular, we appeal to the World. We appeal to all Men of Sincerity and Understanding, what colour of Reason the Representer had here to ask, Why *praying to Images, leave to Sin for Mony, Forgiveness without Repentance*, &c. *should be urged against them to make them the Object of Hatred, and the Subject of popular Fury?* Have not his Answerers more than once published clearly and distinctly

ſtinctly what we do, and what we do not charge them with in every one of theſe Reſpects? Has he convinced them of any Inſincerity, nay, of any miſtake in the ſtating of theſe things? Has he taken notice of any thing they have ſaid about them? Why would he not be brought to confeſs the Juſtice of our charging them ſo far as we have done, and our Juſtice to them in charging them no farther, or at leaſt to confute us by ſhewing wherein we had done unjuſtly? What other Conſtruction now can *Truth* and *Charity* make of theſe Proceedings, but that he would not confeſs that we do them no wrong, and yet could not prove that we do? But then certainly he ſhould at leaſt have been ſilent, and not go on as he does to declaim againſt us; as if he really believed we were thoſe odious Miſrepreſenters and Falſifiers, which he would have the World believe that we are.

He ſays indeed, that the Anſwerer *unhappily takes it to himſelf, as if He and His were arraigned of Lying and Calumny*, &c. *whereas the Repreſenter ſpoke only in general, without ſo much as hinting upon any party or perſon in particular.* But ſurely when after the firſt Anſwer that was made in behalf of the Church of *England*, the Repreſenter without telling us the particulars why, could yet declare that he would *be a Turk as ſoon as a Papiſt, if the Anſwerer had rightly repreſented Popery*; we muſt have as little underſtanding, as he allows to the *Mobile*, not to find that we are principally intended in theſe general Declamations. He thinks the Anſwerers *over ſollicitude to prove his Innocence*, may in ſome *breed a ſuſpicion* of his Guilt. But whether it be Innocence or Guilt that makes us ſollicitous to clear our ſelves, we may now

leave the World to judg. One thing, I take it, is easy to be discerned, that tho our Adversary Rowls in Figures to heighten the injustice under which *He* and *His* have suffered by Misrepresentations, yet he throws the Guilt so faintly upon the Church of *England*, as if he were conscious of being unjust to us all the while.

As for the People of our Communion, whom he complements under the Title of the *Mobile*, we may say without vanity, that how scornfully soever the Representer treats them, we shall never be ashamed to compare them with their Neighbours; and that it would be a better World for the Representer, if they were as ignorant and stupid as he would have them thought to be.

But no more of what he has said in this fit of Anger; for here's a sudden change, and now behold him the gayest and merriest Man alive. He fancies the Answerer left him to wonder who those *We* are that *are not Misrepresenters in a strict and proper notion of Misrepresenting*, *i. e.* who do not belye the Papists. For indeed he *would gladly know who those We* are, *that he might return them his thanks for this so kind Office*—*Did he but know the Men, he would never permit them to lye obscured under the general name of* We. No, *he would particularize them to the World*——*For why? are not such Men Prodigies of Truth, Honesty, and Justice?*——*Men that never misrepresented the Papists! Why these are admirable Men indeed, and not to be heard of every day!* Now really this, with all that belongs to it, is allowed to be very well for the kind, and so much the better, because it more and more appears, that tho he can be angry without a cause, yet a small matter

matter will please him again. For he is delighted beyond measure with wondring who these *We* are, and *wishes there be no mistake in it*, and makes it *hard to imagine who they should be*: But I'le warrant him, he has 'em presently, as hard as it is. For in the very next place he tries whether the Answerer by his *We*, should mean *We Protestants*. And that is a pretty near guess for the First. But then alas! who can believe it, that *We* Protestants *should be no Misrepresenters*? He, *for his part*, would willingly give something for the sight *of the Man that thinks so*, who would be the *greatest Misrepresenter of All, in vouching for the Truth of All that has been inveigh'd against the Papists these hundred and forty years*. Why then, surely, they are not *We Protestants*. But for all that, upon consideration, he thinks he may take it for granted that they are *We* Protestants. For the Answerer *vindicates Protestants*, and for himself, *one may swear he's a stanch True Protestant, as never scrupling at any thing that's for running down the Papists, tho it be carrying favour with and colleaguing the Fanaticks*. And thus the Answerer coming cross in his way, his Fit takes him again; for he cannot abide the Answerer, and so there's an end of his Mirth. And now in sober sadness *we must suppose* that the Answerers *We*, are *We Protestants*. For which reason the Representer begins the World again, and is resolved to prove out of the Sermons and Books of Protestants, that *We Protestants* are Misrepresenters: And so he falls to work about it in good earnest through the remaining part of his Book. Now I am so far from being angry with him for this, that I rather wish some merry Youth were to take him up here, to re-

quite his Railery, and keep up the good humour a little longer. And if it should come into any Bodies Head hereafter, who is given that way, to lay the Pleasant and the Angry Representer together, as it might be done: The Jest would go rarely forward, and that to some Bodies cost too, that may be thinks little on't.

For, was it not the *Representer* that would be *glad to know* who these Men are that do *not misrepresent Papists, these Admirable Men that are not to be heard of every day*; these Men, that *were he but assured of the Being of such Men*, he *should begin to think* Astrea *was returned again!* Did he not wish to know them, that he might *particularize them to the World*, nay and *have their Names Blazoned in every Sheet upon Pillars erected to their Memory?* Yes surely, this was the *Representer* himself. Why then, Dear Sir, be happy and joyful, for many such *Admirable Men*, as these, *are in being* I assure you, and *to be heard of every day*; But because it will be too great a charge to *erect Pillars* for 'em All, I shall at present recommend but two of 'em to your Acquaintance, who are already *particularized to the World*, by the Names of the *First* and *Second* Answerers to *A Papist Misrepresented and Represented.* What pity is it that such Friends should be *obscured* so long *under the general Name of* We, and be no better known to one another? These, Sir, are the Men whom you desire to honour, as if they were made on purpose for it. For why? Tho very honest Gentlemen they are, and their Words may go for as great a matter, yet they have a notable Quality besides, never to think of *Representing* the Church of *Rome*, without *proving* what they say. Why, Sir,

they

they have been lately tryed upon no leſs than *Thirty* and *Seven* Points of *Popery*; and have born the Teſt of a ſevere, watchful, double-dealing Adverſary; and one as vehemently deſirous to find falſe Repreſenters among Proteſtants, as you can be to know the true ones. Now, Sir, judg if theſe two are not likely to prove Right and True Men: For the Adverſary is to this day roaming up and down amongſt other Mens Books to get Proteſtant Miſrepreſentations for them to Anſwer; a plain ſign, you will ſay, that he has found none of their own to call them to an Account for. And ſo having found out your Admirable Men for you, I wiſh you much joy of one another.

Now this is too Blunt, I confeſs, to go for *Railery*; but 'tis *True* tho, and that's almoſt as good: And the Repreſenter may ſee by it how another would have handled him upon this matter, if he had not by good fortune fal'n in my way. It is to me a moſt unaccountable thing, why the Repreſenter ſhould ſearch for more and more Miſrepreſentations, Miſquotations, and ſuch like faults in Proteſtant Authors, and forſake the Defence of his own double Characters, if indeed he thinks they may be defended: But if he does not think ſo, it were but an honeſt Mans part to confeſs it, and then I think the Controverſy were at an end. Certainly the deſign of his firſt Book, which he ſtill pretends to vindicate, was to give us an account of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, upon which ſcore he took upon himſelf the Title of a Repreſenter. 'Tis true he pretended to diſpute for them too; but that deſign fell to the ground upon the firſt Attempt that was made upon

upon him, and I believe he will hardly stoop to take it up again. But then to illustrate the Representing part, he shewed on the other side how Protestants, as he says, have Misrepresented Papists. So that here was a solemn Controversy begun upon so many several points, about Representing and Misrepresenting; and it was, one would think, very fairly carried on by the First Answerer, who we know went on with the Representer from point to point, discovering, where need was, his Ambiguities and Fallacies on both sides, mending his Characters, and giving a correct and plain account of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, in opposition to that lame and deceitful account thereof. which the Representer had published. The sum of the performance was to shew how much and no more we absolutely charge upon the Church of *Rome*, and in matters of charge not so clear as the rest, how far and no farther we accuse them; every Particular being guarded with reasonable Proofs and Testimonies. The second Answerer perceiving into what mistakes the Representer was wandring, by confounding the proper Subject of Representation, with Subjects of Dispute, went as particularly through all the points, and plainly distinguished those things under every one. Now would not any Man of common sense imagine, that, if the Dispute were pertinently carried on, the Question must be this, Who gave the truest account of the Faith and Worship of the Church of *Rome*, the Representer, or the Answerer? And if it were pertinently managed, that this Question must be driven through all the *Thirty Seven* Points, as it has been done once and again on our behalf. And therefore

to

to what end the Representer should trouble himself to find out new Representations in the Books of other Protestants, a Man may well wonder for a while, tho at last he will settle upon the true Reason, that the Representer was Sick of defending his own.

If it be said, that one part of his business at least, goes forwards still, which was to shew, that some Protestants have been Misrepresenters; I desire it may be considered too, whether this was not in order to the setling of a clear and indisputable account between us, what are, and what are not the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, as to the *Thirty Seven* Points. For granting now, (and 'tis a good large Grant to be made at once) that the Representer did sincerely give in his own former Protestant thoughts of Popery, and (as far as he could understand them) those apprehensions what Popery is, which lay in the Heads of the Vulgar; then so far as the Answerers confessed this was not a true Representation, if Protestants did thus charge the Church of *Rome*, so far I say they complied with the Representers design, which was to correct such, if there were any such mistakes going amongst Protestants. But so far as they owned the charge in the Protestant Character to be good against the Church of *Rome*, if the Representer disowned it, he had in this case nothing to do, but to confute their Testimonies, and to shew that in those particulars as well as in others, his *Church* was Misrepresented. And therefore if he had been sincere, the Controversy had proceeded thus on his side; and nothing could have diverted him from proceeding in this manner, if he had been able to make any thing of it. But instead of this, he has for some

time

time forsaken his *Thirty and Seven Chapters*, and employed himself in turning over some Books of Protestants, to find out such Sayings as he thinks there is any colour to call *Misrepresentations*; nay, he is fal'n so low as to pick out what *Misquotations* of Authors he can find amongst them, and to tax them here and there for Historical Passages.

But did ever either of his Adversaries undertake to justify all that any Protestant Divine, or Historian has at any time said in opposition to Popery? Or, was it not possible to give a more honest account of Popery than he did, to discover his fallacious way of representing his own Church, and the true state of the Questions that have been hitherto disputed, without such an undertaking? Nay have not his Answerers effectually done it, without any such undertaking? so effectually that he has forsaken the defence of his double Characters under the *Thirty Seven* Points? Why then must they be bound to Answer for all that every Protestant has said against the Church of *Rome*? Will he answer for all the Popish Misrepresentations of Protestants, that I can bring before him? I shall try him a little as to this before I have done: And I think with some better Grace, than this Task has been put upon us withal. For if it be but a mean way of carrying on the Controversy, as I confess it is, yet he has forced us to it by insisting upon it so obstinately, that we have now no other way to let him see the inconveniency of it, but by turning it upon himself. And, which is something too, we have cleared our Hands of him as to the Original Controversy, for he has dropt that quite away, and so having no Arrears to be reproached with, we may handsomly enough talk with

with him upon this new Score; and I will venture before-hand to say thus much, that he is likely to be as deep in our Debt for this, as he is for his first dealings with us. Nor am I afraid thus to speak my belief in this matter, tho he seems to have taken up a way of writing now, that will not fail him in haste; for as long as he can but find out any new severe Sayings of Protestants against Popery, 'tis but furnishing out a new Book with 'em, and he may as well call it by the Title of a Fifth or a Sixth Vindication of himself, as by any other Title whatsoever. Nay the Vindication will go forward, if he can but find out a *Vulgar Head* without a Name, to say that he believes the Popish Sermons are in an *Unknown Tongue*, or any other thing as extravagant as that.

But tho it be no part of our business to bring off every thing that has been said or done by Protestants, yet I shall a little examine what our Representer has charged those with, whom he has singled out to expose them to the World. For I am much mistaken if even here, he has not exposed himself a great deal more than any Body else: Since he does often take the liberty to fill up his Tragical Declamations against Protestants, by spiteful Constructions, weak Inferences, and now and then by false Accusations, which is never more intollerable, than when a Man is in the same Breath exclaiming against the Misrepresentations of others. For my own part, where his Accusations in whole or in part fall justly, there shall they lye for me, nor will I make another Man's Fault my own by going about to defend it. And if he had taken the same care not to make himself Guilty, by accusing the Innocent, he had come off better upon

this Theme of Arraigning particular Men, as wild as it is.

He begins first with *Sutcliffs Inference* from *Aquinas*, which I confess is a very silly one; tho I think it had been not only for *Sutcliffs* credit that this matter had been let alone, but for *Aquinas*'s too, whose Principle is no very wise one. But I see no reason why the Answerer should have been *ashamed to print it over again*, since he did it only to shew that *Sutcliff* inferred his Accusation by Consequence from what an Author of their own had said, but not to justify the Inference. And for any thing the Answerer has said, the Representer is at liberty to go on with his charge of *Ignorance* or *Malice* against *him that drew the Consequence*, to call him a *Fool* in this business, if he believed the Consequence to be Good, or a *Knave* if he did not.

But I would gladly know how the Representer can clear himself from gross Misrepresentation in the next Instance, where falling upon the Author of the *Representing Catechism* for charging them with praying to Images, he makes it to be a Crime, which his first Answerer had cleared them from, in saying, that we do not *charge* them *with praying to Images without any further Respect*. For may not a Man *pray to Images*, and yet not pray to them *without any further Respect*? This would make one believe that he writes only for the *Mobile*, in whose Heads things cannot *lye distinctly*. But 'tis not so honest tho, especially in a Man that complains of Misrepresentations. But by this time, I hope, he is made sensible of his miscarriage here, by what the Author of that Catechism has done to justify his Charge. And so I pass over this complaint, and come to the next.

P. 19.

Which

Which is of a Sermon that charges them with praying to Reliques too. Now whether the Preacher had any particular Testimonies that there are some amongst them who do *not only Worship*, but *likewise call upon Martin's Boots, &c.* I know not, and therefore cannot at present pass Sentence against him; especially since I am well assured that the Council of *Trent* condemns those in general, *who affirm that the Memories of the Saints are in vain frequented, for the obtaining of help from their Reliques, and other their sacred Monuments*, or Remains. Now if *Martin's Boots* and *Joseph's Breeches, &c.* are the Reliques of Saints, then they are not only *to be venerated*, as the Council affirms, but the Memories where they are, must be frequented also, *for obtaining help* from them. This, I think, is no *Misrepresentation*, no *sly Interpretation*, no Imputation upon them from *Ignorance or Malice in drawing the Consequence.*

P. 20.

Concerning the Construction of *Eorum opis imprtrandæ causâ.* Sess. 25. See *Defence of Exp. of Doctr. of Ch. of Engl.* p. 24, 25.

In the next place the Answerer of *Catholicks no Idolaters*, is made a Misrepresenter for saying, that the common Answer of Catholicks, that their Adoration of the Eucharist cannot be Idolatry, is, because they *believe the Bread to be God, just as the Worshippers of the Sun, believed the Sun to be God*: whereas *the Catholicks do not believe the Bread to be God, &c.* To which I say, 'tis so notoriously known that Papists believe (as they tell us) the Bread to be *Transubstantiated*, that if the Answerer's Words be as they are here set down, 'tis yet a mere Cavil to pretend that he would insinuate as if the Papists believed that which they Adore to be Bread, as we believe it is no more. And the Argument is good thus, if their mistake, who believed the Sun to be God, did not excuse

P. 20.

their worshipping the Sun from being Idolatry; neither will their mistake, who believe what they worship to be Bread no longer, but God, excuse them, if it be Bread still. But I suspect the Words are more clear and full in the Answerer, at least, I make no doubt that they are sufficiently secured from the Representer's Interpretation of them, by other Passages in Connexion. For the Representer has not referred us to the Page, where he has picked up this Exception, which omission I believe was designed, because he has neglected such reference in four or five Instances more. But tho I have upon this disadvantage given him a particular Answer here, yet I do not intend to use him to it. For the employment he has found out for us at present, is not of that weight, that I should be obliged to turn over whole Books, and some of 'em no small ones neither, to find out a single Passage that he thinks fit to carp at. And therefore, at present, I will not be concerned with the Vindication of those *Deductive Absurdities, which* Dr. St. *would perswade to be Doctrines of the Roman Church*: For the Representer here refers to *the general current of his Discourse*; and which is yet more unreasonable, has given me a whole Book written in confutation of the Doctor to answer. For the like reason as he has referred the proof of *a hundred and fifty Lyes* (without giving one Instance) against *John Fox's Acts and Monuments*, to the *Examen of* John Fox's *Calendar*, *p.* 3. *p.* 412. so do I too. Thus also the Arch-Bishop of *York* mis-quoting St. *Thomas* and *Bellarmine*; and *old Dr. Willets* proof out of St. *Bernard*, that the Pope is *Antichrist*; and Bp. *Taylor*'s misquotations and corruptions of Authors, which some *Answerer* of his has *made to appear*, shall

Pag. 21.

P. 22, 23, 24.

shall with all the rest of this kind, pass off together without any further notice. For still I say 'tis too hard an Imposition, for the Representer in a few Lines to oblige us to read over so many Books; and which is by no means to be submitted to, unless the Fate of the cause depended upon it, which I am not yet convinced it does. And therefore once again, I must desire him to give in his particular Exceptions against our Authors in their own Words, if he thinks fit to go on in this way, and to tell us the particular Page or Section where such Passages are to be found; and then he shall have my Judgment in the case: But if he leaves all upon his own and his Friends credit, I shall be so civil as to do so too.

I come now to his charge upon Dr. *Tillotson*, for abusing *Estius*; but whether *Estius* be not more obliged to Dr. *Tillotson* than to the Representer, I leave it to others to judg, when I have given a particular account of this matter. I do acknowledg that those Words cited by the Representer are in *Estius*; but tho I cannot say whether the Dr. minded them or not, yet I believe it will either way appear, that the Representer had but little reason to make this an Instance of our *endeavouring to prove some Folly upon the Papists, out of their own Authors, and then bringing in the Authors quite contrary to their own sense and words. Estius* concludes that the *Fire* which the Apostle speaks of, 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. is the *Fire of the Day of Judgment*, which shall *prove* every Mans work, and *purge that which is not already purged.* And at length he comes to speak of the *Purgatory of Souls after this Life, which seems not only not to be supported, but to be overthrown also by this place of the Apostle, since the whole purgation is reserved*

ved to the last Judgment. To this he answers, that *thus much is manifest against the Sectaries, from his Interpretation of the place, that in the World to come some Sins are to be forgiven,* viz. *theirs who shall be purged and saved by Fire. Nor,* says he, *does it follow from the Purgatory Fire of the last day, that no Purgatory of Souls is left before that day, any more than it follows from the Purgatory of Souls, that there is no purging in this Life*; which, allowing for the principles of his Church, is with the rest that follows to this purpose, a good and solid Answer to the foresaid Objection. And this was the Doctor's Ground for saying, that *Estius contends that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no Purgatory.* But then he goes on, *Besides, we must know that as the Scripture often leaves a particular Judgment to be understood, under a general Judgment, and from the last day in which all shall be judged, will have the day of every ones Death to be understood in which each Man is judged by himself*; *so from the Fire that is to go before the Face of Christ at the general Judgment, and to purge whatsoever at that time remains to be purged, it leaves a certain Fire to be understood, in which a particular Judgment is exercised for the purging of Souls presently after this Life.* Then come in the words cited by the Representer. *Wherefore by this way the Punishment of Souls in Purgatory is well and solidly gathered.* But how is it *well* and *solidly gathered* this way? Does *Estius* say that the punishment of Souls in Purgatory is implied in, or that it does any way follow from that general Purging which is to be at the Day of Judgment? No, he says not a word that looks this way; but only that one leaves the other to be understood, that is to say, if a Man has a mind

mind so to understand it, but not else. For 'tis a shame to repeat that, because where the Scripture speaks of a general Judgment, it supposes that we must dye first; therefore when it speaks of a general Purgatory of Men, it leaves a Purgatory of Souls beforehand to be understood, or *well and solidly gathered*. But the Representer will say, the Question is not whether *Estius*'s way of *gathering* Purgatory from this Text, be good and solid; but whether *Estius* does *contend* for no more than that Purgatory cannot be overthrown by it, as the Dean pretended. I grant this to be the Question, and it shall have an Answer, if it has not had it already. Whether the Dean made the same observation that I have made upon this mysterious business, I cannot certainly say, having never spoken with him about it: But I presume he did, because it will clear him from any great matter of blame, in taking no notice of the Passage cited by the Representer. The Case in short is this, *Estius* was very clear in this Point, that St. *Paul* does not here *speak of a Purgatory of Souls, but of that Fire which is to prove the works of All at the day of Judgment*. But then he must guard himself as well as he could from the charge of interpreting this place, otherwise than the *Latins* had interpreted it at *Florence*; which made it necessary for him to bring in his third Question, *An & quomodo probetur*, whether and how it can be proved from this place, that there is a Purgatory for Souls after this Life, in pursuance of which Question he says what we have already cited. Now, although in his Interpretation of this Text, he could own, as he did, with great modesty and good reason, that he did not follow *Bellarmine*, *Lensæus*, *Vicus*, *Bonaventure* in all things;

things; yet when the Name of a Council lay cross to him, no other kind of modesty would serve but some appearance at least of submission to it. And therefore observing *that the Latin Fathers thought that Purgatory was to be established upon this place, tho the Greek Fathers dissented*; he also *thought* it needful to *gather* it as *well and solidly* as he could, from this place too. For by that time he had done his best, *proving* was dwindled to *gathering*; and to such a way of gathering too, that, the premises being considered, I leave it to all impartial Men to consider, whether so Judicious a Man as *Estius* was, *contended* for the point; or rather if the modest *Estius*, in the strait he was in, did not choose to talk beneath himself, in compliance with the *Latin* Fathers at *Florence*. So that at last we have here an Example of the Servitude of Ingenuous Minds in the Church of *Rome*; but not of *charging Folly upon the Papists out of their own Authors*. For this was that which the Dean declined the doing of; whereas if he had said, *Nay, All that* Estius *contends for from this place is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no Purgatory, altho he makes a hard shift to avoid falling foul with the* Florentine *Council*; here had then been no colour for accusing him of Misquotation, it had also done his business as well; only this had been to charge Folly upon *Estius*, and upon the *Latin* Fathers too, which it seems the Dean had no mind to do.

I proceed next to his Charge upon the Author of *The Devotions of the Church of Rome*. And first he accuses him of quoting *Escobar* for that which he does not say in the place cited; nay, *there is not one word of it to be found in him there*. Now to know whether this be so or not, it is but fair to take the whole Pas-

sage

ſage of that Author, for which he refers us to *Eſcobar*, and not as it is ſlily gelt by the Repreſenter. The Paſſage is this: *They tell us there is a vaſt number of Sins in their own Nature Venial, which are ſo very inconſiderable that an infinite Number of them altogether, will not deprive a Man of the Grace and Favour of God, or make up one Mortal Sin; and for the pardon of which there is no need or occaſion for the Mercy of God.* Now *Eſcobar* in the place cited, *Tract.*2. *Exam.*1. *Chap.*4. in anſwer to that Queſtion, *N.* 15. *Whether many Venial Sins of themſelves, and formally ſpeaking, can make up one Mortal Sin?* ſays thus, *No, becauſe innumerable Venial Sins do not deprive a Man of the Grace of God.* But the Repreſenter will not allow, that there is *one word* of that Paſſage, at leaſt, to be found there, that *for the pardon of ſuch Sins there is no need, or occaſion, for the Mercy of God.* But I am ſure the *thing* is to be found there; For he ſays *N.* 1. that a *Venial* Sin is that which *does not render a Man worthy of Eternal Puniſhment:* And now if innumerable Sins of this ſort do not of themſelves make up one Mortal Sin, I think it is plain that take them altogether, and there is no occaſion for God's Mercy in the pardon of them, unleſs it be Mercy to pardon where there is no deſert of Puniſhment. 'Tis true, *Eſcobar* ſays that they are worthy of *Temporal Puniſhment:* but our Author was not obliged to take any notice of that, becauſe that which he complained of was not, that theſe Doctrines brought Mens Fortunes, in this World, into danger; but that by reaſon of 'em, *Men are in wonderful danger of being cheated in a matter of ſo great moment as their Eternal Salvation.* So that altho the Repreſenter profeſſes that *this Doctrine is contrary to their Belief*, yet, at

least, he must confess that it was not contrary to *Escobar*'s; and therefore that he hath wronged our Author in charging him here with Misquotation.

The same Book says in another place, *p.* 56. That *their saying the same thing so often over, in their Jesus Psalter, is not contrived to help and assist attention,* &c. *but out of pure Vanity and Ostentation, or as it were to flatter our B. Saviour, or the Saint they pray to.* And this the Representer calls *throwing Dirt blindfold,* &c. and such *Misrepresenting*, that if the *State or Civil Government* were served so, there would *be a* ——— *at the end of it.* By which, I guess, he would be content that the Author were hanged. But one would be willing to know first what he has done to deserve it. Why, says the Representer, *Thus is the Reason he gives of our Devotion.* What? that all who use those Forms of Devotion which the Author censures, have no other *End or Intention*, but *pure Vanity and Ostentation or Flattery?* so indeed the Representer would insinuate: But, as I shall make appear, the Author's meaning was that the Repetitions themselves which he spake of, were purely *vain, and do not serve to any good and prudent End:* For which he chiefly blames the *Contrivers* of 'em, as the words plainly enough shew. But what reason he had to say this, was laid down just before in these words. Their *Manuals* of Devotion *are so full of Tautologies, and vain Repetitions, that they must needs come under the censure of our B. Saviour,* Matth. 6. *tho they use his holy Name. For so in the* Jesus Psalter, *at the end of the Manual of Prayers and Litanies, printed at* Paris, *in English,* An. 1682. *in a Litany of Fifteen Petitions, the Name*

Pag. 26.

Jesu

Jesu *is repeated over above* 130 *times: And in the same Book, in the Litany of the B. Virgin, they pray to her by* 40 *several Names, being only so many distinct Praises of her.* Now this the Representer thought fit to suppress, which would have shewn that he did not make *Vanity*, &c. to be *the Reason* of the Peoples Devotion, but that he charged their Forms of Prayer with *vain Repetitions*. And here the Representer should have shewn, if he were able, that the Repetitions mentioned do not fall under our Saviour's prohibition of *vain Repetitions*; that they could be *contrived* for some *good and prudent End*; that they serve to any thing better than *Ostentation* or *Flattery*: Here, I say, he should have employed his Skill, and told us what are vain Repetitions, if these are not. But this was something a harder Task, than to take a Passage by it self, without that Connexion which would have explained it, and to represent the Author by it as odiously as he could. For, I say it again, he does not make *Vanity*, &c. the *Reason* of their Peoples *Devotion*, even in using these vain Repetitions. But indeed he says plainly enough, that they are so contrived for Vanity, and Ostentation or Flattery, that they are not Helps, but Hinderances to Devotion. But however, does not this Author make Vanity to be the *End* and *Reason* of their Contrivance, who composed those Forms? No, not that neither; for tho that Expression *out of pure Vanity*, &c. be, I confess, something obscure, and seems to look that way, yet it was not his meaning, as any Body will say is plain beyond all Exception, that consults the whole place. For thus begins that particular to which this Passage belongs.

Seventhly, Their Manuals and Books of Devetion, which they give their People to read instead of the Scripture, which they forbid to be used, tho they may DESIGN THEM AS HELPS, *yet I must range them amongst the Hindrances of Devotion.* By which it is evident, that he meant not to charge even the *Contrivers* of these *Tautologies*, with any design to lead the People to *Vanity*, because he supposes that they might *design* them as *Helps*, and not *Hindrances*. The Book which he carps at, is written with great Judgment, and no less Modesty; as one may discern by this, that the Representer could not find a more convenient Passage for his Anger to work upon, than that which we have seen. But we must not forget that he is all this while making good his Title of a *Representer*.

And now the Bishop of *Kilmore* is called to account for misrepresenting the Papists, by *putting them upon the same File with Infidels and Pagans.* For, as *Delphos* worshipped *Apollo*, &c. So, in Popery, Pag. 26. *England* worshipped St. *George*, &c. And as the Pagans had their Gods for the several *Elements*, for *Cattle* and *Fruit*, for *several Professions*, and *several Diseases, to pray to: So, in Popery, they have one Saint for the Fire*, &c. Now if this be misrepresenting at all, 'tis misrepresenting with a witness, *i. e.* in the Answerer's Phrase 'tis misrepresenting *in a strict and proper sense*, and in the Representer's Phrase, *downright Lying*. For I do not find that the Bishop affirms any thing in all this, but matter of Fact. But will the Representer say that Papists have not Tutelar Saints for several Countries, and several Saints to pray to, for their Cattle, and

and the Fruits of the Earth? Is it true or falſe that St. *Roch* is prayed to in caſe of the *Plague*, St. *Petronella* under *Agues*, St. *Apollonia* againſt the *Tooth-ach*? I ſhall expect his Anſwer to this; and if he dares not deny it, as I am perſuaded his Modeſty will not ſuffer him: I ſhall then ask him where the miſrepreſenting lies? If it be ſaid to lye in this, that the Biſhop *puts them upon the ſame File with Pagans*, let us ſee how far he does ſo. He had laid down that Rule of God's Word a little before, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* And then he proceeds to the Compariſon, in which indeed he muſt be ſuppoſed to tax the Papiſts with contradicting that Rule, by their practiſe of worſhipping their diverſity of Saints, no leſs than the Pagans by ſerving their ſeveral petty Gods. But he is ſo far from ſaying, that in all reſpects they are as bad as Pagans, which one would underſtand by *puting them all upon the ſame File*, that he does not enter upon a Compariſon of Aggravations, in reſpect to this very matter of Worſhip; but only ſhews that Rule is violated this way, no leſs than that. Now if this be a true Charge, I conceive it is no ill manners to ſpeak the Truth in a Caſe of ſuch vaſt Concern. If it be Falſe, the Repreſenter had done more Service to his Cauſe, and won more deſerved Thanks from his own Communion, as well as ours, by ſhewing the difference between the one and the other, with reſpect to that Commandment, than by declining, as he has done, not only the Juſtification, but very craftily the Confeſſion too of the Fact upon which the Charge is ground-

grounded: Inſomuch as they *in whoſe Heads nothing lyes diſtinctly*, would be almoſt perſuaded, that the Repreſenter accuſed the Biſhop of *downright Lying*, and that perhaps the Papiſts have not their Tutelar Saints, and Saints proper for ſeveral Occaſions to pray to, as the Biſhop pretended. But any thing in the World ſhall ſerve to ſwell the Charge, when Proteſtants are to be ſet out for Miſrepreſenters.

As little reaſon do I find for his ſevere charge upon the ſame Biſhop, for obſerving that *ſome place their whole Worſhip of God in Bodily Exerciſe*; meaning, as I have good reaſon to offer for it, not *All*, but *Some* Papiſts. For the Biſhop proceeded to lay the ſame charge upon the Diſſenters (without any currying I aſſure you), nay, to thoſe of our Communion alſo, as any one may ſee, *pag.* 11. And what was ſaid particularly of the Externals, in which thoſe Papiſts truſt, whoſe Religion runs out into nothing but External Show, ſeems to me to note no more, than the greater danger they of the *Roman* Communion are in of falling into this kind of Hypocriſy, by reaſon of the vaſt number of Ceremonies and Obſervations which they, above all other Chriſtians in the World, have brought into Religion. Theſe are the Paſſages which Anger and Ill-will have pick'd out of the whole Sermon, to expoſe the Biſhop to His Majeſty's Diſpleaſure; by which one may ſee what little cauſe the Repreſenter had to ſay, that *he pretends to His Majeſties Word for abuſing them.* If the Reader deſires to know the motives he had for Preaching and Publiſhing this *Sermon*, he will

Pag. 26, 27.

not

not take them, I ſuppoſe, as they are Ridicul'd by the Repreſenter, but go for 'em to the *Preface* it ſelf, which declares what they were; and then he will find that the Repreſenter has *abuſed* the Biſhop.

Now whereas he found ſome Paſſages *in the Book of Homilies* of the *ſame* ſtrain with what he had noted in the foreſaid Sermon; the ſame Anſwer will therefore ſerve for both: And what he adds beſides, in contempt of *thoſe Divines* that *compiled* the *Homilies*, is as eaſily anſwered with Contempt. And ſo I come to that *hearty Family-Prayer*, which, as he ſays, *has raiſed up* from Turk and Pope, defend us Lord, *a Note or two higher*; in as much as it runs thus. *O Lord confound Satan, Antichriſt, with all Hirelings and Papiſts.* This Prayer, he tells us, *is added to the end of the Singing Pſalms, in a Common Prayer Book, Printed at* Oxford, *in the Year* 1683, *in Twelves*; by which I gueſs he would bring that Univerſity too, as well as the foreſaid Biſhop, under His Majeſties Diſpleaſure. And therefore this Accuſation is not to be paſſed lightly over. Now *Henry Hills* could have given him abundant ſatisfaction in this matter, if he had been conſulted. For, upon the beſt Inquiry I can make, I find that no Pſalms, in Twelves, were Printed in *Oxford* before the the Year 1684, and therefore no ſuch Impreſſion, as the Repreſenter means, could be there in 1683. But this is not all: for neither had thoſe Printed in 1684, that *hearty Family-Prayer*, which he talks of. But the Truth of the Caſe is this, *Henry Hills*, or he and his Partners, had Printed theſe very Pſalms, in Twelves

Pag. 23.

Twelves, which the Representer mentions, and that to a vast number, as I am informed by those who will make it out, if it be required. Now if *Henry Hills* bound up his Psalms with the *Oxford* Common-Prayer Books, the University is no more to answer for that, than if he had bound up his own Life with one of them. It is such another Suggestion the Representer offers at in a Marginal Note elsewhere, where he makes the Fire of *London* to be imputed to the Papists, in the *Plates of the Common-Prayer Books Printed at* Oxford, An. 1680. For no such Plates were Printed there, however they came to be bound up with some Common-Prayer Books Printed that Year at the University. I am apt to think *Henry Hills* is able to give as good an account of this too, as another. And I believe he can guess very nearly, who did not only Print since 1678, but has also very lately Sold, a certain *Confession of Faith*, as *hearty* as the foresaid Family-Prayer; for there *Idolaters and Hereticks, Papists and Ana-baptists*, are all put together, as *Limbs of Antichrist*. But some Men take themselves to be priviledged to do these bold things themselves, and to accuse others of the like when they have done. I am sure that either the Representer, or he, is not a little to blame for these unhandsome Insinuations; my own suspicions in this case I do not care to tell, and therefore I leave it betwixt them Two, *to set the Saddle on the right Horse*, as the Representer speaks upon another occasion.

Pag. 30.

Ano-

Another way of Miſ-repreſenting them which he complains of, is *in laying on the colours with ſo much craft on the Papiſts Tenets, that though they are the very ſame, with what the moſt learned Proteſtants hold themſelves, yet they ſhall appear ſo foul and monſtrous, as if nothing leſs than a certain Damnation attended their Abetters. This*, he ſays, *is done in ſeveral inſtances*; which makes me wonder that he choſe ſo unlucky an inſtance, as that of our *rendring them ſo Unchriſtian, for not allowing Salvation to any out of their own Church*; in a word, for damning *Proteſtants*. But do we Miſrepreſent them in this? mark how the Repreſenter makes it out, Dr. *Tillotſon* in the fore-mentioned Sermon, *inveighing againſt the Uncharitableneſs of Papiſts — at laſt in a rapture of Charity concludes*, 'I have ſo much Charity (and I deſire always 'to have it) as to hope that a great many among them 'who live piouſly, and have been almoſt inevitably de-'tained in that Church by the prejudice of Education 'and an invincible Ignorance, will upon a general Re-'pentance find mercy with God. Now inſtead of this, the Repreſenter *expected* from the Doctor *ſome extraordinary piece of Charity both for the Reformation and example of the Papiſts*; and *yet*, ſays he, *after all the outcry and buſſle, he wont allow one more grain of Mercy to the Papiſts, then the Papiſts do to them, that is onely to ſuch who having lived piouſly and truly repented of their Sins, have an invincible Ignorance to attone for all other errours of the underſtanding, which is the very Doctrine of the Papiſts, in reſpect of ſuch who die out of the Communion of their Church.* So that we have Miſ-repreſented Papiſts in pretending that they do not allow as great hopes of Salvation to us continuing and dying Proteſtants, as we allow to them continuing and dying Papiſts.

Now I confess I am under some temptation to shew who is the Mis-representer in the Case; but this is so good a hearing, that I will not go about to clear our selves from being Mis-representers upon this occasion, but take him at his word, that here we are Mis-representers: nay, more than that, I will thank him for taking all opportunities to report us for such Mis-representers, to the people of both Communions; for thus it may be hoped that we shall never more be troubled with that Argument to perswade Ours, and to confirm His, in the Communion of the *Roman* Church, that since we grant the Papists a possibility of Salvation, and they utterly deny a possibility of it to us, the Communion of the *Roman* Church must needs be the more safe, inasmuch as both parties agree in a possibility of Salvation in that Church, but they do not both agree upon such a possibility in ours. And since we are proclaimed Mis-representers upon this account, I desire also that from this time foreward, the Trade of going up and down with peremptory denouncing Damnation to all of our Communion, may be at an end, and never heard of more: And that no advantages may be made of our charitable hopes and concessions in behalf of some that dye in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, since it seems the *Doctrine of the Papists is the very same in respect of such who dye out of that Communion:* Or at least, that no regard be given to those of the Roman Church who shall hereafter positively denounce Damnation against us, since the Representer will have it that we are as positive against them, inasmuch as to say that *Papists are guilty of sins inconsistent with Salvation, is but to say, they are damned in another phrase.* The Representer I say, who takes upon him to correct all false notions of Popery, and is therefore much to blame,

if

if he be ignorant of the Doctrines of Popery, has declared to the World, that whether in the way of Hoping, or of Cenſuring, *Proteſtants and Papiſts ſay the ſame thing of each other:* And therefore I think the foreſaid Requeſts are very reaſonable ones; ſo that this one matter is in a way of being fairly compounded, and if the Repreſenter likes it, I am ſure both parties are well pleaſed. P. 28.

For want of other complaints, he takes up one at length, which he had dropt ſome time ſince, *viz.* That we *rake together ſome odd and extravagant Opinions of ſome Authors, to ſet them down for the received Doctrine of the Church.* Which complaint he ſupports by nothing elſe but ſuppoſing that the ſo often-mentioned Archbiſhop of *York* is guilty of this in citing *Bulgradus*, &c. and that this *is enough to make any extravagancy paſs for an Article of Faith.* Now he does not ſo much as make it appear that this Archbiſhop pretends the Extravagancies for which he brings thoſe Authorities, to be *Articles of Faith* in the Church of *Rome.* But how far their Church is chargeable with the ſeveral Extravagancies of their Authors, and what uſe we may and ought to make of their Divines and Caſuiſts, &c. in the Controverſies now on foot, the Repreſenter has been already told very diſtinctly; and when he thinks fit to Reply, he ſhall not want an Anſwer. In the mean time, to convince us of the unwarrantableneſs of this method, and what a wretched thing it is to charge private Doctrines upon a Church as Articles of her Faith, he brings in a Popiſh Preacher inveighing againſt the ill Manners, and eſpecially the diſloyalty of Proteſtants, upon one paſſage in the *Decay of Chriſtian Piety*, another in Sir *R. Baker*, and a third in *Jovian.* Now I ſay, let them who do thus argue againſt the Church of *Rome*, as he makes his Popiſh Preacher to inveigh a- P. 29. Pap. not Miſr. rep. by Prot. p. 67, 68, 69. Anſw. to Pap. Prot. p. 9. P. 30, 31, 32.

gainſt us, let them I ſay take the ſhame of it. But for any thing that he has done hitherto, the men are yet to be found out: though I do not know but upon very diligent ſearch ſome one ſuch or other may be taken amongſt us; and when that happens, he ſhall go for me, and keep company with that once Proteſtant who believed the Sermons of the Papiſts were made in a language unknown to the People. Now he confeſſes all this *Harangue* to be a piece of Sophiſtry, which he has
P. 33. put into the mouth of a *Popiſh Preacher:* Which is enough for me, and I am not at all moved by his pretending this was done to make us aſhamed of *practiſing it in good earneſt*, as he has *ſeen and heard* that we do. For this is a reaſon I am now pretty well uſed to, it being the very ſame wherewith he defends that ridiculous Sermon which he compoſed for the *Zealous Brother*. And therefore I ſhall even pin this *Harangue* to the remainder of that Brother's Sermon, that when one is called for, the other may not be forgotten.

And ſo at laſt we come to Miſ-repreſenting, in *relation to ſome matters of Fact and Hiſtory*, and here he *hopes the Reader will diſcover* notable things. The firſt Miſ-repreſentation of this Kind, in which he inſtances, was the Miſ-repreſenting of the *Rich Hangings*, the *Maſſy Plate, and other things which Adorned the*
P. 33. *Altars in the times*, before the Reformation, the *Candleſticks*, *Crucifixes*, and *Shrines*; *Three Epiſcopal Houſes*, with *Four or Five Churches*, &c. For theſe were Repreſented as *Superſtitious*, or *Superfluous*, and *forthwith were immediately blown up*. Now a man ſhall not preſently find how this comes to be Miſ-repreſenting, the Papiſts in *relation to ſome matters of Fact and Hiſtory*. He names but one Proteſtant, ſpeaking of theſe things, *viz.* Dr. *Heylin*, and he too, is brought in

in agreeing with the Repreſenter in charging thoſe doings upon *Covetouſneſs*, *Ambition and Envy*; nor is any other Cited as contradicting him. Was not the Repreſenter full of choler and bitterneſs, that he muſt needs eaſe himſelf whether it be in fit place or not? I ſee the bottom of this buſineſs plainly enough: If that Reformation of Doctrine and Worſhip which our Church made, be not blackened enough already, he is reſolved to charge upon it all the faults of the great Men that made advantages by the Change. But muſt the Vices of the States-men in thoſe days neceſſarily affect the Reformation? Why then muſt not the Vices of Popes affect Popery? If he has a mind to it, let him repreſent the former ten times worſe then they were, and when he has done, I will ſhew him as many Popes Repreſented by their own Hiſtorians as really bad, as he has made thoſe by Fiction, and this too by Hiſtorians of no leſs Credit amongſt them, then Dr. *Heylin* is with us. The Repreſenter owes us a good Turn, and if he can but bring in the word *Miſ-repreſenting*, 'tis all the pertinence he cares for, though it be Miſrepreſenting *Plate* and *Hangings*.

Again, becauſe he fancies that King *Henry* the Eighth *made way for Proteſtantiſm to enter into the World* (in which however, he is miſtaken) he taxes him boldly of *Vile Extravagancies*, the reſpect that is due to *Crown'd Heads*, no nor the conſideration of that *Line* in which this Prince ſtood amongſt them, being not able to reſtrain him. But where is the Miſ-repreſentation complain'd of? Certainly the Popes Power here might be an *Uſurpation*, though the motive upon which *Henry* the Eighth threw it quite off, (as it had been curbed by his Predeceſſors before) ſhould not prove the beſt in the World: But let the Repreſen- P. 34.

ter

ter here also use his liberty of rendring him as odious as he can, remembring all the while that the Faults of that Prince reflect no less dishonour upon the Church of *Rome*, then upon the Church of *England*, as 'tis now Reformed: For 'tis certain, that in all other points he was a Papist, excepting that only of the Supremacy; unless the Representer will say that the whole of their Religion is in effect this, that the Pope should be all in all, in the Dominions of every Christian Prince in the World.

Luther comes next upon the File for *Marrying a Nun*
P. 34. contrary to his *Vow of Chastity*. By which he means a Vow of *Cælibacy*, as if the Marriage Vow, were not a vow of Chastity too. But do not their own Divines say, that the vow of Continency may be dispensed with? And has not the Pope dispensed in greater matters? Had *Luther* marryed with his Dispensation, he had it seems committed no fault at all. And we are apt to think that if notwithstanding his Vow, he had good reason to marry, he might do it safely enough without the Popes Dispensation. But where's the Mis-representation now? Why, here's a Vow of Continency Represented as a rash and inconsiderate Vow, and this is *Mis-representing Papists in relation to matters of Fact and History*. And thus also honest Sir
P. 35. *William* Mis-represented *Chalices, Crosses, Images*, nay, *Guineas*, &c. *Into Popish Trinkets and Trumpery, and made them fit for seisure*. But I say neither was Sir *William* honest in doing it, nor the Representer over wise in mentioning it here.

His next Fling is at Sir *Richard Baker*, who upon the Executions of several great Men in Queen *Mary*'s Reign, chanced to say according to his wonted Eloquence: *Now the Cataracts of severity will be opened,*

ed, that will make it rain Blood. Well, but to bring off honeſt Sir *Richard* for once, he does not ſay that this *ſeverity* was Tyrannical or Unjuſt, for if he had, certainly the Repreſenter had brought us all under the laſh for it: But the ends of theſe great People being Tragical, he thought good to ſet the matter off with a *Tragical*, or, as the Repreſenter calls it, a *pat phraſe*, without any further deſign. And then as for the other Blood ſpilt in Queen *Mary's* Reign, which he ſeems to charge altogether upon *Provocations, Tumults, Seditions*, and *Rebellions*; he is guilty of the ſame fault, which he accuſes Proteſtants of, *viz.* Of Repreſenting things by *halves*. Were none put to death in thoſe days but for ſuch cauſes? Were *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Taylor*, and almoſt all the 300 ſpoken of, burnt for Hereſy or not? Was not the Queſtion concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, the burning Queſtion? For thoſe that were guilty of the Abuſes he mentions, they might thank themſelves, we defend them not. But what colour is there for Repreſenting all as ſuch? And why will the Repreſenter put us upon talking of theſe things, who had ſaid nothing of them, if he had not forced us to it in our own defence.

But to ſee now how much there goes in the telling a ſtory: *Queen* Elizabeth *put to death*, as he ſays, *Two* P. 36. *hundred Perſons upon the ſcore of Conſcience, without any actual Crime or Miſdemeanour againſt the Ancient Statutes of the Land.* Two hundred Perſons! Truly I do not know but in her long Reign of about 40 Years, ſo many might be put to death. But I wiſh the Repreſenter, ſince he pronounces in general with ſo much confidence, had named *One* or *Two* that were put to death *upon the ſcore of Conſcience*, and likewiſe what point of *Conſcience*

it

it was. However something is necessary to be said in general Answer to that Charge which he plainly intends, though he would not plainly speak it out. In short therefore, about ten Years after the Queen came to the Crown, Pope *Pius Quintus* sends over his Bull for the Excommunicating and Deposing her, upon which followed the Statute against the Execution of it: Which yet did not hinder several Priests and Jesuits from trying to have it Executed, in pursuance whereof the Queens Life was more then once in danger. And therefore when no other Remedy would serve the turn, all Popish Priests of the Queens Subjects, were banished under the Penalty of Treason, and had forty days given them to prepare for departing. This Law was made at least twelve years (I believe more) after the Popes *Breves* were sent hither: And upon this Law some Priests that were afterwards found here, were Executed, and some were not, who though coming into *England* contrary to the Law, yet withal, giving security for their dutiful Behaviour to the Queen, were, without changing their Religion, set at liberty: For, if we may believe one that knew these things better then the Representer seems to do, though our Princes judged it necessary for their own safety, that this Law should continue in force, yet to avoid the doing of any thing that looked like putting men to death *upon the score of Conscience*, they qualified the rigour of it by their own Mercy, where a Treasonable design did not otherwise appear. For when *Goodman* a Jesuit, was Reprieved by King *Charles* the 1st, and the King was Expostulated with by the Parliament about it, he signified the cause to be this, that *Goodman* had been found guilty, merly as being a Priest, which was the reason of the

An. 1640. Jan. 25.

King's

King's mercy, and that in this clemency he did but follow the examples of his Father, King *James*, and of Queen *Elizabeth*. Now whether we should believe King *Charles* the Martyr, or our Representer, I leave others to judge. This general account may serve for his general charge; and I do not think fit to run out into more particulars, unless the Representer gives occasion; but I leave him to consider better of these things: And when he has done it, he may perhaps feel a little shame for having said just before in the Case of Queen *Mary*, *Now one would think to be just to Crowned Heads, the Blood should not be exposed alone to the People, but likewise the Occasions and Provocations given:* And in Queen *Elizabeth*'s case I will adde, And the mercy also that was shewn, notwithstanding those *Occasions* and *Provocations* that were *given* her.

But whereas he calls the Law we speak of a *Law of her own contriving, a Law so cruel that the like is scarce to be found among the* Mahometans, *who though they have conquered many Christian Nations, yet never, as he has heard of, made it Treason for their Natives to profess their own Religion, or maintain their Pastors.* To let pass the Misrepresentation he insinuates, of *making it Treason to profess their own Religion*, it would almost tempt a man to search the Records of old Time, to see if something has not passed in the World as *cruel* as this Law, if it had been executed to the utmost rigour. For why? should Queen *Elizabeth*, under whose Reign our Nation purchased some Glory abroad, suffer now at home the imputation of being the most Tyrannical Prince that ever was in the World; beyond the examples of *Mahometans?* and of Mahometans too in their severity towards the Christian Nations which they have Conquered; why, this is strange indeed,

and not to be taken upon the Representers word: For there are *Annals* that speak of a certain *Law*, not indeed for the Banishing of people *upon the score of Conscience*, but the keeping of them at home to be tormented for their Conscience. Had they been suffered to use the Liberty that our Saviour once gave, of Flying into another Country, when they were Persecuted in their own; it had been a favour in comparison to the restraint; and Death had been a mercy to the Vexations they endured. The *like* to this indeed *is scarce to be found even amongst those* whom the Representer speaks of: And which made the case yet harder, this *People* had not deserved ill of the State, they neither sided with Forreign Powers, nor with Domestic Rebels; nay, they had behaved themselves so well, that there was nothing but their Vertue to make them feared. But Histories say that those of them who escaped by miracles of Providence, were well received everywhere, and especially by a Prince who was not of their Religion, but yet to his immortal Glory gave them Refuge and Relief in his own Countries.

As to the *Powder-Plot* which he next mentions: His insinuation concerning my Lord *Cecil*, has been so often exposed, and if it were true, is so unable to lessen the guilt of those that were concerned in it, that I see no reason why I must needs enter into that History: We do not charge all of that Communion with it, but we have reason vehemently to suspect all that went about to excuse, and positively to condemn all that thought fit to praise the Traytors. But if we should have charged, as he pretends we do, the Church of *Rome* with this Treason, yet I am confident the Rebellion of the *West* stands not altogether so fair to be imputed to the Church of *England*: For surely there was no

no Act of this Church for the Excommunicating and Depoſing of the King; but it was the ſight of the Pope's Brief to ſuch a purpoſe as that, inſpired one of the Traytors, as himſelf confeſſed, with thoſe thoughts that at laſt ſetled upon the *Powder Plot.* And I think it was a Church of *England* Parliament, and a Church of *England* Army that ſo loyally ſerved his Majeſty upon that occaſion in the *Weſt*: But let the Repreſenter ſhew, if he can, that the Papiſts were as ſerviceable in the prevention of the *Powder Plot.*

We are now drawing to an end of a tedious Complaint, which ſurely cannot laſt much longer, when he is fain to ſpin it out with a ſtory of the *long diviliſh* P. 39. *Knives* which Papiſts were ſaid to procure for *cutting of the Proteſtants Throats.* For I am ſo perfect a ſtranger to the leaſt report of this matter, till I met with it here, that I can ſay nothing to it. As for the Fire of *London*, that I confeſs I have heard of, and likewiſe that many charged it upon the Papiſts; now for thoſe that did ſo, I hope I may without offence offer that excuſe for their credulity, which I take a hint of from the Repreſenter himſelf: It could not be expected but that the grief of ſo undoing a Calamity in vaſt numbers of ſuffering People, ſhould diſcharge it ſelf in accuſing thoſe as the Authors of it, who, as they believed, were well pleaſed with it: As for the Repreſenter, what his thoughts are towards *London*, he has given us plainly to underſtand, in calling it *a Proteſtant Sodom*, which *Heaven* conſumed. Now I dare ſay this was not meant for a lamentation over the ſins and ſufferings of the City: But if men will go on to inſult at this rate, they ſhould however, be leſs clamorous againſt thoſe miſtakes of which the greateſt occaſions are given by themſelves.

Then as to that which he calls *a Monsieur's Invention*: They that gave credit to it, have this to say for themselves, That *Du Moulin*'s public offer to make full proof of his story, when Authority should require it, stood many years, even to the day of his death; which was no improbable argument that he was provided with reasonable good testimony, though it was not thought fit to call upon him for it. This may be said to shew, that if there were never so many that swallowed the story, yet this was no reason for the Representers furious exclamations: For I am by no means satisfied that they who believed it, did so *in defiance to all their Senses*; for though there were *Actors* and *Contrivers* of the Murder of King *Charles* the First, *as public as the noon-light*, yet I do not feel any such *contradiction* in supposing that some *Contrivers* there might be who were *not as public as the noon-light*: And when the Representer thinks of it better he will say so too, unless he will say, that because the Contrivers of that dark Treason of the *Powder Plot*, were at last as public as the noon-light, therefore that *it was in all likelihood a Contrivance* too, of *the good Lord Cecil*, cannot be credited, but *in defiance to all our Senses*. And yet after all, how does it appear that we have laid any such stress upon *Du Moulin*'s Relation, as the Representer intimates: For my own part in all the conversation I have had amongst Protestants, I can remember nothing concerning it, but that it has been sometimes a little wondered at, that he was never required to prove his story. And therefore I doubt the Representer has here plaid the part of an unwise man, in reviving a story to the disadvantage of the Papists, which died with the first report of it, as we thought at least; for unless the Representer thought we had some reason to believe it, why should he

he go about to complain that we do believe it? I think we have been more Juſt to his Party, than he has. For our ſenſe as to this matter is, that ſince now the ſtory is not capable either of being proved, or diſproved, it is to be let fall, and the World is no more to be troubled about it; though whilſt *Du Moulin* was alive, it was not to be expected but that one or other would be harping upon it.

At laſt he comes to the *Garagantua Miſ-repreſentation of them all, that is, the Divine* Oates *with his Popiſh Plot.* And here, as from a Caſtle where he is ſafe from all poſſibility of Aſſault, he bids defyance to us with all the Rhetoric, that Anger and Scorn can inſpire a man withal. But becauſe he lets fly at the *Pulpits* for this, and ſo makes the Clergy to have given what Authority they could to *Oates* his lyes from their *Pulpits*, I muſt needs change a word or two with him about that in our own Defence, and tell him that neither is himſelf of that Credit, nor the thing it ſelf ſo likely, but that it ſtood in great need of particular proofs. I know not but that amongſt Ten thouſand Men, here and there one might deliver the news of the *Pilgrims*, and the *Black Bills* from the Pulpit. But I never heard of any that did, and I almoſt think that if the Repreſenter had known a few Inſtances of this Kind, out they had come, if it had been for nothing but to ſupport the Credibility of his general Accuſation. And to go further with him, whereas he confidently ſays, that *the WHOLE Plot was received with that welcome and Credit, that what would have been queſtioned in the very Scripture, was entertained without any ſcruple.* I will make bold to ask him, by whom it was entertain'd, did himſelf believe the *whole* Plot, while he was a Proteſtant? If he did, undoubtedly P. 40.

doubtedly we have not lost one of the wisest of our Party, If he did not, neither did any body else that ever I could hear of, though perhaps many might believe more then was true. But for a more particular account who believed much, who little, who nothing at all of *Oates* his Discoveries, and the reasons of the several Opinions, he must excuse me for that; I am resolved not to be drawn in. Nor have I lately spoken with every Man in the Nation. And 'tis onely for a Representer to talk of these matters, and to pronounce generally without exception, though he does it also without examination of the particulars before hand.

Thus far I have waited upon the Representer in examining the Reasons, upon which he pretends that we use I know not how many Methods to Mis-represent Papists, though it has been every step out of the way: For if all had been true that he pretends, what is all this to the Defence of his *Thirty-Seven* Chapters? What is it to his Answerers, who had no more to do then to rid their hands of those Thirty-Seven Chapters? And they have done it so effectually, that the Representer has thought good to rid his hands of them too.

But I think by this time, it may appear that he has all this while given us just cause to complain, that we are many ways Mis-represented by Papists, though the Representer without just cause, was resolved to be before hand, in the same Complaint against us.

For not to repeat those *Mis-representations*, *False Constructions*, and *Wry Interpretations* of Protestant Authors, *&c.* which I have shewn him to be guilty of, in examining some of his Complaints; it were a very easie matter to convict him of no less untrue then spite

ſpiteful inſinuations againſt all Proteſtants without exception in this, and in his other pieces. I ſhall at preſent give but one Inſtance, and that in this his laſt Reply, where he ſays, that the *Proteſtant Perſwaſion has its Name, Being, and ſupport not from what it is in its ſelf, but from what it is not, in defying and proteſting againſt their Neighbours.* P. 17. 'Tis eaſie to ſee what notion of Proteſtants ſuch Paſſages as theſe are intended to imprint upon the minds of Men. But does the Repreſenter in good earneſt, believe that our Religion is a mere Negative Religion, and that we ſhould have none at all, if we had no *Neighbours to deſie*, and to *proteſt againſt*? Or does he believe that our Religion ſo far as it is Negative, is *ſupported* by *defying and proteſting* againſt other Men; does he not know that we at leaſt pretend to *ſupport* it by Reaſon, Scripture, and Antiquity? Nay, does he believe that there are no Affirmative points of Religion which we maintain againſt them, and in reſpect of which they do in reality proteſt againſt us, though it ſeems we have got the *Name* of Proteſtants. If he does believe thus of us, much more if knowing the contrary, he ſays ſo however, Where's Truth, Charity, or Juſtice? If we take the Religion of Proteſtants, as it ſtands in oppoſition to the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, it is in many Points Affirmative, and the Negative is on that Churches ſide. For inſtance, that God onely is to be Worſhipped, is as Affirmative a Concluſion, as that God is but One, and that Chriſtian people are bound to read the Scriptures is as Affirmative, as that they are bound to ſay their Prayers, and that the Laiety have a Right to the Communion under both Kinds; is ſurely as Affirmative, as that they have a Right to *One* only. Why then does the Repreſenter ſay, that the

the *Protestant* Profession *has its Name, Being, and Support; not from what it is in its self, but from what it is not?* But to let this pass, what although the Points held by us in opposition to the Church of *Rome*, were only Negatives; yet, why must we be so bitterly represented, as if our Perswasion were supported by nothing but pievishness and a Spirit of Contradiction to our Neighbours? Why must we be brought in as *defying and protesting against our Neighbours?* As if we opposed their Doctrines and Practices, in despight to the Jews, and not rather blamed them for saying and doing things which we at least think are not to be justified? There are divers things surely, which neither Christians nor Men ought to do; And so far as our Religion stands in not doing such things, one would think it is not the worse for being Negative, nor our Practice to be blemished for having its Name from what it is not. And therefore when Men come in with their Negatives in Religion, and their protestations against false perswasions and evil practices, they are not without more ado to be represented as *Defying* and *Protesting against their Neighbours.* But least of all, should it be insinuated, as if our whole Religion in effect, stood in this *Defying* and *Protesting*: For we do in the first place Glory in this, that we are *Christians*, though we are not ashamed to be called *Protestants.* In our Religious Assemblies, where we confess our Faith before God and the World; we profess no other Articles of Faith, then those in which the Church of *Rome* agrees with us. By this it is that we are Christians, and it is this that makes them so. This Faith which we profess, and into which we were baptized, is the Foundation of our assurance, that if we live accordingly, we shall be saved, and of our hopes

that

that those among them, who are disposed to receive the Truth, and repent heartily of all known sins, shall find Mercy with God, notwithstanding their Captivity to those Errors, which if we should profess, we could not have the least hope for our selves. In the mean time for our Negatives against that Church, we offer in our own defence, that the Religion which the Scriptures teach, is such a Negative Religion as ours, they not injoyning, and in some points forbidding what we do not do; and that the truly Primitive Fathers neither professed those Doctrines, nor did those things, which the Church of *Rome* would have us to profess and to do; so that their Religion was not more positive, nor less Negative then ours. But if it grieves good Men in the *Roman* Communion, that there should be amongst Christians, any Protestation of one Party against what is done by another, it is a grief also to us; only with this difference, that we cannot help it, but they can. For if they will Reform the Terms of their Communion by the Scriptures, and Primitive Antiquity, they shall soon see an end of our protesting, and that our Perswasion is not supported, as this Representer saith, by *defying and protesting against our Neighbours*; then which he could not have said a viler thing against us, no not if he had put us *upon the same File with Infidels and Pagans*; since this is in effect to say, That we have no Religion but in crosness to other People.

But at this rate we have been used all along, though we have made no complaints of it, onely they force us to it now, whether we will or no: Thus even in their *Catechisms*, where one would expect plainness and sincerity, we find our selves Mis-represented in that manner, as if there was no such way of making Novices

fast to their Church, but by giving them false notions of ours: For at present, to name no more then their famous *Doway* Catechism, there you shall find the Teacher giving this wise reason, *Why Protestants are so so divided, and damn one another for Mis-believers? Because*, forsooth, *it is the very ground-work of Protestancy that all men, even the whole Church of God, are fallible and subject to errour.* We say indeed that all men are subject to errour; but the very *ground-work of Protestancy* is not as this Catechist pretends that the Church of *Rome* and every other Church is subject to errour, but that she hath actually erred, and that grievously too. And his Inference from hence is no less a Mis-representation then his principle: *So that*, says he, *they cannot pretend to Certainty or Infallibility in any one point of their Belief.* So that because he is pleased to put *Certainty* and *Infallibility* together, he must needs teach his Scholar that we have not so much as *Certainty* of our Faith, nay, not of *one Point* of it; and which is still more false, that we *cannot pretend* to it. No wonder that we find it so hard a matter to get a little Discourse about Religion with those whom they have had the breeding of, when we see what an absurd pretence to Religion they represent ours to be all at once; especially since they take care to let them know, that *'tis not well possible for any two Protestants or Sectaries to be of one Religion, every man expounding the Scriptures as he lists, and no one having power to control the others Exposition of it.* Which if their Schollars believe, they must needs conclude that Protestants must profess as many Religions almost, as they are men and Women; since it *is not well possible for any two of them to be of one and the same Religion:* And, I think, any body may see that this is taught to discourage all who are educated in this per-

Abridgment of Christian Doctr. *p.* 42. *Doway* 1655.

Id. *p.* 42.

perſwaſion of us, from hearing what we have to ſay for our ſelves, ſince by hearkning to one or two of us they are never the nearer, but muſt talk perhaps with a million before they can underſtand the Religion of Proteſtants, nay, and ſhall then be as much to ſeek for it as they were at firſt. For what he ſays of *every mans expounding the Scripture as he liſts, no one having power to control the others Expoſition of it:* It is alſo an untrue ſuggeſtion, if by expounding the Scripture *as we liſt*, he means arbitrary and groundleſs Expoſitions of Scripture. Which when the Repreſenter pleaſes, I can prove the Church of *Rome* to be more guilty of then any Church that we know in the World beſides: If any are guilty of it amongſt us, there is a power in our Church to control them, which has alſo been uſed upon occaſion, unleſs by power he means a *Cudgel*, and this we do not take to be Church power. Again, he ſays that *all Heretics pretend equally to the Scripture for their Novelties and Hereſies*, (which is not true neither) *no one of them ever yielding to another:* Which is notoriouſly falſe; for many of thoſe whom he calls Heretics, have yielded to the reaſonings of others out of the Scriptures, who are alſo Heretics with him: And this plainly ſhews that ſome of theſe men care not what they ſay to diſgrace us, when they will ſo poſitively affirm a thing which 'tis impoſſible for them to know but it may be falſe; nay, which 'tis not *well poſſible* for them not to know that it is falſe. Id. p. 43.

'Tis after the ſame way that our Doctrines and Practices are repreſented by retail; of which I ſhall give you but one inſtance which I well remember, and that is where the Catechiſt aſſuring his Scholar that their Laiety *receive whole Chriſt under one kind:* Tells him alſo that this *is incomparably more than the pretended Re-*

Id. p. 205. *formers have under both, who receive onely a bit of Bakers Bread, with a poor ſup of common Vintners Wine.* By which ſcandalous way of repreſenting our Communion to a Novice, he would be apt to believe that when we celebrate the *Euchariſt*, our great buſineſs is to ſend to the Baking-houſe for Bread, and to the Tavern for Wine; and ſo we fall to eating and drinking without any more ado. If he would be Steeling his Novice againſt us, he ſhould at leaſt have been ſo juſt to us, as to let him know that we do not give the people *common Bread and Wine*, though we do not pretend to give them the naturalſubſtance of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood.

For that way of Miſrepreſenting us by charging the particular opinions of ſome Proteſtants upon all: They have the confidence to do it, even in thoſe points wherein neither Proteſtants nor Papiſts are of the ſame mind among themſelves: And though the *Doway* Catechiſm repreſents us ſo divided that 'tis not well poſſible for any two of us to be of the ſame Religion, yet when again 'tis for their turn to Repreſent us otherwiſe, there is not an odd opinion of any Proteſtant, but forthwith it belongs to the Religion of all the reſt. Thus we have been charged for *making God the Author of Sin*; and that for nothing but for the ſake of thoſe Opinions held by ſome Proteſtants, which are no leſs vehemently defended by ſome Papiſts: In which kind of Repreſentations no man, I think, has out done the *Reconciler of Religions* (whoever he was) printed in the year 1663. *They teach*, ſays he, *profane, falſe, and ungodly Doctrines, as for example: That God is the Author of Sin; that Chriſt deſpaired upon the Croſs.* Which later Opinions, this man and *Fevardentius*, and divers others, as I well remember, faſten upon *Calvin*; and then talk as if it was the received Doctrine of all Proteſtants

teſtants. So ſays he, *They ſay that Chriſt ſuffered the pains of Hell upon the Croſs, and that this was his Deſcenſion into Hell. See* Calvin *here*, Pſal. 15. Now I think *Calvin* does ſay ſo: But 'tis ſo ſmall a matter in Compariſon, to charge what one ſays upon All, that I ſhall lay no great ſtreſs upon it. But that which follows is admirable: *Neither*, ſays he, *are they miſerably mad only, but alſo diabolically malitious; for its of meer purpoſe they ſay and do thus, leſt that by clear places of Tradition and Scripture they ſhould be conſtrained to confeſs that there is a Purgatory.* Are not theſe rare Men, thus at once to charge us with what we do not ſay or do, and withal to pronounce concerning our *Intentions* in ſo doing, and that in this Vile manner, that no honeſt Heathen ever uſed his Neighbour ſo? Nay, if you will believe this Repreſenter, *They that hear Sectarian Miniſters are not Believers, for they do not truly believe in God the Father Almighty, nor in Jeſus Chriſt his only Son.* For he knows their Hearts better then they do themſelves: and let them be never ſo confident that they do, he will prove that they *do not believe in the Holy Ghoſt.* And he peremptorily ſays that they *do not believe the Communion of Saints:* And laſtly, That *neither do they believe forgiveneſs of ſins.* For which he brings an excellent Reaſon, Becauſe they ſay ſay, *The Prieſts cannot forgive Sins:* Though we do not ſay that neither, but only that they cannot forgive Sins *Abſolutely*; which now they would perwade us too, to be their own Doctrine. Thus he has made us Infidels almoſt throughout the Creed, only at laſt he grants, that we believe the *Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and the Life Everlaſting*; which I wonder at, becauſe it was as eaſie to invent a reaſon why we believe not this neither, as for all the reſt.

P. 14.

Ibid.

P. 15.

P. 16.

reſt. But then even in this matter, we are no better Believers then the Devil. *For,* ſays he, *this they believe, and ſo do the Devils.*

No wonder therefore that he comes afterward, and puts us npon the *ſame File with* Turks *and* Heathens. *As the* Turks *are divided and ſubdivided among themſelves, ſo are the* Proteſtants. *The* Turks *whereſoever they come, demoliſh Churches, deſtroy Croſſes, and beat*
P. 37. *down and break Altars, and Images; ſo do the* Proteſtants. *The* Turks *cannot abide Praying to Saints; no more can the* Proteſtants. *The* Turks *love not Beads nor Holy Water; no more do the* Proteſtants, *The* Turks *above all things, hate the moſt Holy Sacrifice of the Maß, and ſo do the* Proteſtants; *which alone is enough to ſhew that in their Religion or Belief, they are like* Turks *and* Heathens. This I think may ſerve at leaſt, to ſet againſt the *Biſhop* of *Kilmor*'s Parallel: Though I ought to ask the Biſhops Pardon for making the Compariſon. For as to that Parallel between *Proteſtants* and *Turks*, it is not in every particular true, for *Proteſtants* do not *demoliſh Churches whereſoever they come*, nor *break down Altars*, nor *deſtroy Croſſes*, nor always *Images*. And as to the particulars that agree to both, how much malice ſoever there may be, I am ſure there is little Wit in putting them and us together upon theſe Accounts. For certainly, we are no more obliged to do any ill things, becauſe the *Turks* themſelves forbear them, then we are obliged to forbear any uſeful or innocent Cuſtoms, merely becauſe the *Papiſts* uſe them. Had this Reconciler ſhewn our Agreement with the *Turks* in ſome Practices. that we could not but confeſs they are to blame for; this indeed, had been a ſhrewd Inſtruction to us, to amend that in our ſelves, which we cannot but condemn

demn in People so grosly deceived as they are. Now this it was, that the Bishop of *Kilmore* did in that Comparison of the *Papists* Worshipping their *Tutelar Saints*, with the *Heathens* Worshipping their *Petty Gods*. The Papists do with us, justly condemn these Practices of the Heathens. The Bishop only desires them, being thus prepared, to look at home. But to infer that in *our Religion, we are like* Turks *and* Heathens, because we forbear those things, which the *Turks* are to be justified in not doing; is a Mis-representation of us, upon so *wry an Inference*, that if there be not want of *Wit*, to excuse it, it will be found equivalent to a down-right Mis-representation, which the Genius of this Author, as it appears, by the particulars of this Book, makes me fear it is.

And of a great many particulars which I might note, there is one not to be let pass, and that is, that he does in *very good earnest*, affirm that we adore the Sacrament, though the Representer would be thought to charge us with it, *little more then in Jest*. For says the Reconciler, *Though they say thus of us, for Worshipping of Images, yet they can dispense with themselves in Worshipping their Sacrament*. And if this be not jesting, 'tis something a great deal worse; for it is as notorious, that we do not Worship the Sacrament, as it is that the Papists do. P. 16.

But to go on with him a little farther. *Their Preachers* saith he, *what are they forsooth? Intruders, Thieves and Robbers, Hypocrites, Ravenous Wolves, and Murderers*; *Sons of* Belial, *False Prophets, and Priests of* Baal; *which is their Heresy, Rebellion and Stubbornness against the Church.* ——— *And if the Preachers be so, What must the Hearers be? Why sure enough, they shall both fall into the Ditch of Everlasting burning Brimstone* P. 51.

and

and Fire, &c. *Unless they be Converted, do Penance, and live in the Church.* Now this way of Mis-representation by railing at, and damning us, is as crafty a method, as any they have to imprint upon weak minds an incurable prejudice against our Communion. For when we are confidently represented as damnable Wretches, that shall certainly be *Damned*, if we continue *Protestants*; especially by Men, that at other times talk demurely, and always look gravely when they give us these good words, it cannot be expected, but that some or other should believe there is more then ordinary Reason for it, though they are not able to find it out. We may say what we will in our own Defence, let but these Men go on to say still that we are *Damned*, and the very noise and din of these words, and the like, shall make them deaf to all the Reasons we can bring. And therefore every degree of this dealing, is to be condemned in any party, wherever it is found, because it is a way to work upon the Passions and Imaginations of People; and instead of directing, it does but confound their Judgment. But I must needs say, we have suffered under this injustice by those of the Church of *Rome*, beyond any examples that I have yet seen.

Of which, I will give the Representer one instance so remarkable, that it may serve instead of a great many. Mr. *Harding*, who had to do with no less a Man than Bishop *Jewel*, thought fit to use us in this Fashion, as follows: *Ye are moved by the Instinct of Satan; the Devil hath you fast bound, and ye are the Children of the Devil: Ye are the limbs of Antichrist.* Our Church, he calls *the Synagogue of Antichrist and Lucifer*; and we are no better with him, then *Prophane Hell-hounds, Wicked* Cains *brood, Turkish* Huguenots

Confut. Fol. 202.

F. 195.

guenots *worſe then Infidels*; nay, he ſays that the *Fiends of Hell begat Lutherans and Calviniſts*; and that *we would ſay if we durſt, that Chriſt is the Abomination of Deſolation, and that Antichriſt is the true God.* And then I think he had reaſon to ſay, That *the Devil coming from Hell, hath carried us away.* Thus in his *Rejoynder* he bids the *Hell-hounds of* Zuinglius *and* Luther's *Litter, bark until their bellies break*; and calls the *Defender* one that *is like a mad Dog*; and for all this, tells him that he *will leave his Vile Eloquence to himſelf*, [the Defender.] He that has a mind to ſee more of this, may find two Pages in Folio full of it, juſt before the Preface to the Biſhops Defence of his Apology. Now it is eaſie to Judge what effects this kind of Eloquence will work upon weak minds, eſpecially when he that uſes it, has the Face to ſay as *Harding* did in the Preface to his Confutation. *The manner of writing, which I have here uſed, in Compariſon of the Adverſaries is ſober, ſoft, and gentle, and in reſpect of their heat, bitterneſs, and railing, as many tell me, over-cold ſweet, and mild.*

F. 183. F. 194. F. 225. Rejoynd. p. 178, 207, 111.

I do not ſay, that they never ſpeak of us, but in this ſtrain; for I do well remember that the *Apology* for the Papiſts which came out about Six or Seven Years after the Reſtoration, treats us after another manner, I mean *Us* of the Church of *England*; for then it could call us *Men, Brethren, and Fathers*, and would fain unite them and us together againſt the *Fanatics*: For why? then we were ſome-body, and it was not amiſs to *curry* with us: But there was a time when we indeed were as no-body; and then the Diſſenters were worth being *curried* with; inſomuch that Dr. *Holden*, who was always eſteemed by us as a perſon of the beſt temper and trueſt moderation among them,

could not forbear shewing the difference he put between them and us, even where there was no necessity at all so to do, but the mere necessity of *carrying*: For to a *Discourse concerning Infallibility in Religion*, Printed at *Amsterdam* 1652. Dr. *Holden* gave his approbation in these words amongst others, That the Book *demonstrated the false Foundations of the Presbyterian Consistory*; *of the Socinian Ratiocination*; *of the Independents Private Spirit*; *and of the* ERRONEOUS, OR RATHER NO GROUNDS OR PRINCIPLES OF THE LATE PARTICULAR ENGLISH PROTESTANT SCHISMATICAL SYNAGOGUE. But why are the several Dissenters so softly and gently touched? *Presbyterian Consistory*, what harm in a *Consistory?* or in *Ratiocination?* Nor is much anger expressed in giving the *Private Spirit* to the *Independents*. Why, surely these are all complemented in comparison to the Church of *England*, which is *the Particular English Protestant Schismatical Synagogue* of *Erroneous, or rather of no Grounds or Principles* at all. But why this difference I say? Why, nothing is plainer, it was then THE LATE Church of *England*: But when the *Apology* came forth, it was then the *Present* Church of *England* again. Then was Then, and Now was Now. Thus we are used by some of the very best of them.

But to return to our *Reconciler*, He wisely considered that we might take sanctuary in the *Bible* against the hard words and reproaches they persecute us with; and therefore to spoil that retreat, he will not allow that we have the Word of God amongst us; for thus he saith, *The Protestants, or Sectarian* Bible *is defective, therefore evil, and consequently not the Word of God; for besides, what we have above said, almost every year they*

they correct it and mend it, chop it and change it, as they do their Almanacks, adding thereunto what they will, and ſubtracting what they pleaſe. This is ſuch Miſ-repreſenting, that I had rather the Repreſenter ſhould give the proper name to it, then do ſo my ſelf: Nay, if this man were to be believed, we make ſuch material alterations in the Verſion or Edition of our *Bible* every year, as infers a neceſſity of altering our Religion upon it, the *Bible* being the ground of our Religion; for ſays he, *Neither do they change their* Bible *onely, but alſo their Religion and Faſhion thereof grounded on it. If then every following years* Bible *be better then the former, why may not the next years* Bible *be better then this year, and ſo to the end of the World? and in the mean time the* Sectarian Bible *never be perfect, or better then a yearly Almanack; not ſo good as an Almanack for* Ever; *as is* Erra Pater, *or the* Shepherd's Prognoſtication, *or* Seaman's Calendar. *Why then ſhould it be more the Word of God then* Æſop's Fables, *or the* Turkiſh Alcoran? One would think now that he had done his worſt againſt our *Bible*; but he underſtood his trade better then ſo, & therefore becauſe this calumny needed it very much, he was reſolved to help it with a good ſhare of that confidence, which I obſerved before, was peculiar to theſe men. For as if he had been yet *over cold, ſweet,* and *mild,* he mends the matter by ſaying, that our *Bible* is *worſe then Æſop's Fables; it is Diabolical Inventions, and Heretical labors, and a Sacrilegious Inſtrument to deceive and damn all ſuch poor Souls as believe it, and therefore worthy to be burnt with Fire in the middle of the Market at noon, and let all the people ſay Amen, ſo be it.* This was a good hearty man I warrant him, and would not willingly loſe his buſineſs by doing it by halves.

Recon. *p.* 38.

P. 41.

I should now have done with him, but that I find him afterwards imposing upon his Reader with as shameful a *Down-right* Mis-representation of us, as ever
P. 50. was invented: For says he of our Clergy, *All their Mission was either the inspiration of a Spirit they know not what, or the Commission of a Child, or the Letters Patents of a Woman, or the illicit and invalid ordination or mission of or by one* Scory *an Apostate Monk, who ordained the first Bishops at the* Nagg's-head *in* Cheapside, *in Queen* Elizabeth's *time.* Now I would desire the Representer to consider with himself how he would have set us forth to the World, if we had invented the story of Pope *Joan*, as they have done this of the *Naggs-head* Ordination: Why, surely he would have muttered up all his Figures to represent us as the lewdest Varlets upon the face of the Earth? But though we have received that story from their own Authors, and know what advantages to make of it, if we needed them; yet we are very willing to hear what any learned man can say to disprove it, and to allow all reasonable presumptions against it. Of our Adversaries we beg none of this candor, and desire no more of them then not to tell tales of us of their own invention. As to this *Nagg's-head* business, I ask the Representer two things, one is, Whether himself believes it? the other, Whether they have not commonly and boldly reported it up and down amongst us? Let him then remember how he declaimed against us for creating in the people such an aversion to Popery, which he did not wonder at, be-
Reply p. 43. cause he *considered that ten thousand Pulpits have been for many years declaiming against them, where every man has had a liberty of exposing them as he pleased*, &c. Well, but what must we have expected by this time, if the *Ten thousand Pulpits* had been all this while at their

their Service, when they have not been afraid to publish such scandalous untruths against us, even whilst they had not all the liberty of doing *as they please*, which he imagines we have taken: If they take this freedom of telling of Tales, even here amongst us, without any colour of proof, and against the Testimony of unquestionable Records; we may, I think, without Uncharitableness guess that where they are under no restraint, they *represent* our *Doctrines, as they please*, and *charge them with what Consequence and Interpretations they please, and expose our Practices as they please*, &c. *And make Narratives of* us *as they please*, and *make* us *as guilty as they please*, and *have made Truth and Gospel of any thing against* us *as they please*. And when I consider these things, I cannot wonder that in some parts of *Spain* (where the Mis-representing Trade has gone rarely forward) they are made to believe that we *English*, since we turn'd *Heretics*, are grown *Satyrs*, and have gotten *Horns* and *Tails*.

I am now something weary of this unprofitable Labour, and shall therefore add but one thing more, which is, That some of them are wont to Reproach their Adversaries only by their Faults, when they pretend to give them their whole Character, and to add what they have any Colour for, out of their own Heads, and sometimes without any Colour at all; but especially when the manner and circumstances of their dying are to be related, for here the Attention and Passions of the Reader are commonly raised very high. *Of* all which *Bolsec*'s Life of *Calvin*, is a memorable Instance: Thus when he brings him to his declining Age, he tells us the *several Diseases which afflicted him for many years to the last Gasp, were a certain and expres Token and Testimony of God's anger against him*; and answers that Objection

Bolsec. Vit. *Calv.* c. 22.

jection againſt it, from the Calamities that befel *Job*, by the deliverance God ſent him at laſt: Which kind of reaſoning gives every man to the Devil that dyes of painful and tormenting Diſeaſes. But not content to argue from thoſe Diſeaſes by which *Beza* ſaid that he ended his Life, *viz. Conſumption, Cholic, Stone,* &c. incident all of them to Old Age, and eſpecially to Men of a Sedentary Life: *Bolſec* adds one out of his own Brain, *With which,* as he ſays, *God's open Enemies by his juſt Judgment have been puniſhed,* viz. That he had *a moſt filthy and poyſonous Ulcer about his lower parts, which were corroded by Vermin. Thus,* ſays he, *Honorius* the Second King of the *Vandals,* Dyed, after he had *perſecuted the Orthodox Church eight years*; thus *Maximianus, the moſt cruel Enemy of the* Chriſtians; and thus *Antiochus*; and thus *Herod,* who *Uſurped the Honour of God*; thus *many more Hypocrites and Enemies of God periſhed, who under pretence and colour of Sanctity and Zeal, had fought againſt the Truth, and after a miſerable death in this World, have been thrown headlong into the Everlaſting Torments of Hell.* And in this manner, as he ſays, was *Calvin* marked out; nay, he affirms it to be *moſt true,* that *the Wretch not being able to bear his horrible Tortures, called upon the Devil, and expir'd with Oaths, Curſes, and Blaſphemies.* Well, but one would expect now a very notable proof of ſo wonderful a matter as this was, and of all the reſt that he ſays upon this occaſion: Why, ſays *Bolſec,* they *have given Teſtimony to this, who were about him in his Sickneſs to the laſt: And therefore let* Beza *and others deny it as they pleaſe, the thing is ſufficiently plain.* Was ever malitious Story ſupported by more feeble Teſtimony then this? It ſeems we muſt take *Bolſec*'s word, that *Calvin*'s Friends and Servants reported theſe things:

things: But can any man be ſo ſilly as to think that if *Boſſec* had come to the knowledge of this by any certain or probable means of Intelligence, that he, I ſay, would have ſuffered us to go without it? But then if he had pretended particular Proofs, he had laid himſelf open to be particularly baffled: for which reaſon the ſafeſt way, was to ſay in general, The Servants ſaid ſo, and the thing is plain, and there's an end.

Thus alſo *Cochles* repreſents *Luther*'s Death, *viz.* That he went to Bed merry and drunk, and was next morning found dead in his Bed; his Body being black, and his Tongue lolling out, as if he had been ſtrangled, which ſome think was done by the Devil, ſome by his Wife; and as they carried him to the Church to bury him, his Body ſtank ſo that they were conſtrained to throw it into a Ditch, and ſo they departed. Which is a very pleaſant ſtory, but that another tells it ſo croſly, that 'tis impoſſible but one of them muſt be guilty of Leeſing. The truth is, they were ſo impatient, that theſe kind of Tales were told and ſent up and down before the Man himſelf was dead, as I ſhall further acquaint the Repreſenter when he deſires it.

In the mean time I *forbear*, as he ſays, and wiſh there may be no occaſion given, to carry on the Controverſy in this manner. This very little that I have ſaid of a great deal more that remains, being deſigned only to ſhew them what may be done, if they think fit to leave the Queſtion, and to fall upon us for Miſrepreſenting them, inſtead of maintaining their Doctrines like Scholars and Diſputants.

There remains now but one thing more to be conſidered, and that is, What Reaſon the Repreſenter had to tax the Author of the *Expoſition* of our Doctrine,

ctrine, with *wishing for Moderation in the deepest Satyr, condemning the want of Civility in others, with the most exasperating Reflections of his own,* and a great deal more to this purpose; which according to the most impartial Judgment that I can make, is all said without Cause given. And the declamation of the Representer here upon, shews only that if he had lighted upon a fit Subject, the man does not want words to set it out to the Life. But what has that Author done? He charges them with *their Art of Palliating, with want of Fairness and Civility, with laying aside Moderation, and falling into a vein of Lightness and Scurrility, forgetting that Religion is the Subject, and Christians and Scholars their Antagonists,* &c. These things I confess he lays to their charge: But where's the *Satyr*? Where are the *Exasperating Expressions*? The *Pen steep'd in Gall,* and the *Uncharitable Exposing,* for which *he seems,* to the Representer, *but to make a serious Droll*? 'Tis true enough, that to accuse men of *Palliating* their Religion, *of want of Fairness*, of *falling into Lightness*, of *trivial Jestings*, and *accommodating their writings to the Genius of Scepticks, who divert themselves at the expence of all Religion.* This I do acknowledge to be *Satyrical*, and as the Persons may be upon whom it falls, *Exasperating*. But then the *Satyr* and the *Sharpness* lyes not here in the *Manner* of saying, but in the *Truth* of what is said: And I hope that Author does not deserve ill of these men, for speaking the plain Truth of them in Expressions so soft and inoffensive, as if he had taken time to choose the gentlest: If they do not now represent their Religion with that Sincerity which one would expect from *Christians*, I know a great many sharper words, whereby one might justly express that Fault, but

Reply. p. 45.

scarce

ſcarce one that has leſs keenneſs, then that they *Palliate.* If they bring in a *Zealous Brother Ridiculing* our Church, inſtead of Defending their own; could any thing be more cool, then to complain of *want of Fairneſs and Civility*, then to reſent their *Falling into a Vein of Lightneſs and Scurrility*; and to put them in mind that *Religion is the Subject, and Chriſtians and Scholars their Antagoniſts.* If this be turned into matter of Accuſation too, we have an ill time of it, who muſt have to do with men that can well enough endure to do all theſe things, but cannot endure to hear of it again, though in the mildeſt way of Repreſenting it: Had that Author, whoſe Books the Repreſenter may be aſhamed to acknowledge that he has read; had he, I ſay, written in the Repreſenter's ſtrain, had he ſaid any thing like making the King's Capital City a *Proteſtant Sodom*, and the Fires of *Southwark* and the *Temple*, our *Evangelical Proofs* againſt the Papiſts; and the Preachers *Theme* the *alarum to keep the drowſie Flock from nodding*; had he ſet the Repreſenter any example of ſuch unhandſome levities as theſe are; and which, to ſay no more, are hardly tolerable upon the ſtage, then indeed the juſtice of his charge would not have born *him* out in his management of it: But when that excellent man had charged them with no more then what he has terribly proved, and that is *Palliating*, or with no more then what is flagrant in their laſt pieces, viz. *Want of Fairneſs and Civility*, &c. in a word, with no more then what is true; and this without virulency or ſo much as levity of expreſſion, (for which I leave the World to judge by thoſe very phraſes which the Repreſenter has picked out of his laſt Book) and yet for this, *his Pen* muſt be ſaid to be *ſteeped in Gall*, and his *Antagoniſts expoſed under the moſt odious character*

imaginable. I might well make more, but I cannot make less of it, then that some men are very much *exasperated* by being shewn to themselves.

And now, if I had a mind to take every occasion, he has given no small one by bringing in that Parable in the Scripture, *Of the Trees chusing a King*; to illustrate his own *seriousness* in the *Drolling* Sermon he composed for the zealous Brother: *But I forbear at present*, because he pretends to *forbearance* too.

For the advice that he has given the forementioned Author, I do acknowledge that it were very good, but that it wants pertinence and occasion; and for that reason looks more like an unjust Accusation, then a charitable Admonition. But if he thinks good counsel is always to be received with thanks; I say to him what he says to our Expositor, *Let him turn to such of his own Communion who have given bad examples* in the business of *Mis-representing.* And let him too that gives good advice take it also; which though it be not so easie, it will yet be better for him: But above all things, *Let him endeavour that their Arguments and Methods for the defeating of Protestants, be not such as any Jew may take to strike at Christianity, and every Athiest to make a sham of all Religion.* Which advice is so good, that 'tis pity it should be lost upon those that need it not; and therefore I desire him to recommend it to the Author of the Parallel between the Doctrine of the *Trinity* and the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation.* Let the Representer do his duty well upon this occasion; and I can hereafter tell him of others wherein his interest will prevail more then mine.

But because the Representer is *sincerely* of our Expositor's *mind, That this way of handling Controversies, doth rather exasperate then heal our Divisions.* I will tell him

an

an effectual way to prevent it, Let them Represent their Religion like men that are not afraid to let the people know the bottom of it; and when they offer to defend their Doctrines, let them not pretend to go on with their first undertaking, when they leave it, and fall into Invectives against their Adversaries: for if they would honestly confess that their business is to make us look as odiously as they can, they should, for me, go on in this way till they are weary, without any recrimination. If the Representer desires also that these Controversies may have an end, let him perswade his Friends not to produce testimonies out of the Fathers for Popery, without taking notice of the Answers that have been so often made to them: Which advice, if it had been given and taken, we had not seen the *Consensus Veterum*, and the *Nubes Testium*. Let them not furnish out Books with Arguments that have been often offered, and as often answered; but take the Controversie where it was left by their Predecessors and ours, and then go on with it if they can; which had been very good advice to Mr. *Clenche*. Let them not begin all over again, to spin out the time, and to make our Disputes endless: Let them write and do like men that hope to gain upon the World by Reason and Argument. As for our parts we shall be careful to follow his last Advice, and to prove our selves true *Members of the Church of* England, not onely by maintaining the Truth which She hath taught us, but by practising those *Principles* and that *Loyalty which we Preach*; that as we are sensible to whom we owe the Liberty we enjoy, so we may approve our selves not altogether unworthy of it, but be always able to give some good account of our selves, with respect to these Controversies, both to *God* and the *King*.

THE END.

Advertisement of BOOKS.

THE Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* truely Represented; in Answer to a Book intituled, A Papist Mis-represented and Represented, *&c.* Quarto.

An Answer to a Discourse intituled, Papists Protesting against Protestant Popery: being a Vidication of Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants: and containing a particular Examination of Monsieur *Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, in the Articles of Invocation of Saints, and the Worship of Images, occasioned by that Discourse. Quarto.

An Answer to the Amicable Accommodation of the Difference between the Representer and the Answerer. Quarto.

Bishop *Wilkins*'s Fifteen Sermons. Octavo.

Sermons and Discourses, some of which never before printed, the third Volume. By the Reverend Dr. *Tillotson* Dean of *Canterbury*.

A Manuel for a Christian Souldier. Written by *Erasmus*, and Translated into English. Twelves.

Printed for W. Rogers.